

Mr. LAUSI. Well, I think that we got a good deal for the Government on this.

Mr. KIRWAN. But you might have gotten a better one by putting it up for rebidding.

Mr. LAUSI. We sent circulars out on that bid.

Mr. KIRWAN. You sent circulars out on the first one, but not on the second bid?

Mr. LAUSI. No.

Mr. KIRWAN. All right; we thank you, Mr. Bartlett, for your appearance this morning.

Mr. BARTLETT. Thank you, sir.

(The following information was submitted by the Department of the Interior subsequent to the hearing:)

Upon rejection of the proposals received the sale of Bluebeard's Castle Hotel was negotiated with Antilles Enterprises, Inc., Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, for \$410,000; downpayment of \$75,000, and balance in 20 years with interest at 3 percent. In addition Antilles Enterprises, Inc., was to invest the sum of \$150,000 in major capital improvements within 18 months after taking possession of the hotel.

This proposal was submitted, as provided by law, to the House and Senate Committees on Government Operations; the House committee met on June 9, 1954, and considered the matter. The approval to consummate the sale was given on June 9, 1954, by the House Committee on Government Operations, and on June 16, 1954, by the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS
GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas, Chairman

HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California	RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida	Massachusetts
W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas	ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, Kansas
JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi	GERALD R. FORD, Jr., Michigan
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama	EDWARD T. MILLER, Maryland
JOHN J. RILEY, South Carolina	HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, New York
CHARLES B. DEANE, North Carolina	GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin
DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania	

FRIDAY, JUNE 1, 1956.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY BUILDING

WITNESSES

ALLEN W. DULLES, DIRECTOR, CIA
L. K. WHITE, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, CIA
[REDACTED] CHIEF, BUILDING PLANNING STAFF, CIA
F. S. POORMAN, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
WALLACE K. HARRISON, ARCHITECT

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

CONSTRUCTION

For the preparation of detail plans and specifications and the construction of a Central Intelligence Agency headquarters installation and for other purposes as authorized by title IV of the Act of July 13, 1955 [(Public Law 161)] (69 Stat. 349) to remain available until expended.

☐ It contains information of CIA interest that must remain classified at TS S S

Mr. KIRWAN. I am not talking about that at all. I am talking about why did you not rebid it?

Mr. LAUSI. We had authority from the General Services Administration to negotiate this bid, which we did.

Mr. KIRWAN. They gave you that authority?

Mr. LAUSI. Congress gave GSA the authority and GSA gave us the authority.

Mr. KIRWAN. They gave you authority to go out and negotiate with this party after receiving bids, and the other people who bid on it did not have that same opportunity. You say some were poor bids, so you sat down with a fellow and negotiated for it.

Mr. LAUSI. That does not mean we would get any better bids on the second go-around.

Mr. KIRWAN. You could make a try anyway, could you not?

Mr. LAUSI. We got a lot of bids on this thing as it was circularized all over the country.

Mr. KIRWAN. But they were not good bids. You were on the job and did not accept any of them, but because some fellow came in and gave you \$10,000 more, you took it. That was pretty questionable, don't you think?

Mr. LAUSI. I do not agree that it was questionable at all.

Mr. KIRWAN. You do not agree that it was?

Mr. LAUSI. No, sir.

Mr. KIRWAN. Well, the fellows who bid on it did not like it.

Mr. LAUSI. You mean the original bidders?

Mr. KIRWAN. Some of them, yes.

Mr. LAUSI. We could not accept those bids.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am not saying that you could accept these bids, but there were no bids on the second go-around. You simply gave it to this fellow because he gave \$10,000 more than the amount of the other bids.

Mr. LAUSI. We negotiated with several of the original bidders, Mr. Kirwan, to see if we could get a better bid from them.

Mr. KIRWAN. They did not have the money?

Mr. LAUSI. Well, we had some cash sales, or offers, from some of them.

Mr. KIRWAN. Well, there was some reason why you did not go in and have a second bidding. Instead, you just negotiated with them.

Mr. LAUSI. There is absolutely nothing wrong with negotiation in such a case.

Mr. KIRWAN. I agree that there is nothing wrong with negotiating, but why did you not try another bid on it?

Mr. LAUSI. Well, I suppose we could have done that.

Mr. KIRWAN. They do that all over America. I pick up the paper every day and I see where they do it. For instance, the State of Ohio threw out all bids on the Ohio Turnpike on the advice of their engineers because they were unsatisfactory and requested new bids five times before they accepted a bid which was satisfactory.

Mr. LAUSI. We did have bids on this initially.

Mr. KIRWAN. But you just put one bid out and because the bids did not come up to your expectations, instead of requesting new bids you gave it to some fellow just because he gave you \$10,000 more than was offered by any of those unsatisfactory bids.

Program and financing

	1955 actual	1956 estimate	1957 estimate
PROGRAM BY ACTIVITIES			
1. Design, specifications, and supervision.....		\$1,785,000	\$184,000
2. Construction.....		23,000	42,320,000
3. Roads.....			6,774,410
Total obligations.....		1,808,000	49,278,410
FINANCING			
Unobligated balance carried forward.....		3,692,000	3,413,500
Unobligated balance brought forward.....			-3,692,000
Appropriation.....		5,500,000	49,000,000

Obligations by objects

Object classification	1955 actual	1956 estimate	1957 estimate
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY			
10 Lands and structures.....		\$8,000	
ALLOCATION TO GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION			
02 Travel.....		500	\$4,000
06 Printing and reproduction.....			40,000
07 Other contractual services.....		1,784,500	180,000
10 Lands and structures.....		15,000	42,280,000
Total, General Services Administration.....		1,800,000	42,504,000
ALLOCATION TO DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
Total number of permanent positions.....			10
Average number of all employees.....			9.5
Number of employees at end of year.....			10
Average salaries and grades:			
General schedule grades:			
Average salary.....			\$6,223
Average grade.....			GS-10.0
01 Personal services (permanent positions).....			\$59,000
02 Travel.....			800
04 Communication services.....			400
05 Rents and utilities.....			2,000
06 Printing and reproduction.....			3,000
07 Other contractual services.....			27,230
08 Supplies and materials.....			1,000
09 Equipment.....			300
10 Land and structures.....			6,277,000
15 Taxes and assessments.....			100
Total, Department of the Interior.....			6,370,830
ALLOCATION TO DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
Total number of permanent positions.....			46
Average number of all employees.....			43.7
Number of employees at end of year.....			4
Average salaries and grades:			
General schedule grades:			
Average salary.....			\$5,491
Average grade.....			GS-8.7
01 Personal services (permanent positions).....			\$240,000
02 Travel.....			3,000
04 Communication services.....			1,600
05 Rents and utilities.....			9,000
06 Printing and reproduction.....			12,000
07 Other contractual services.....			132,580
08 Supplies and materials.....			4,000
09 Equipment.....			1,000
15 Taxes and assessments.....			400
Total, Department of Commerce.....			403,580
Total obligations.....		1,808,000	49,278,410

JUSTIFICATION FOR SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A BUILDING
FOR THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Prior developments

For several years the Central Intelligence Agency, in cooperation with the General Services Administration, has been seeking to provide a central headquarters building to accommodate its personnel presently housed in 34 buildings, widely scattered throughout the city of Washington. More than a year ago, based upon the determination that there was no existing permanent structure adequate or suitable to Agency needs, authorization was requested to construct a permanent office building in or near the District of Columbia to house Agency personnel stationed in the Washington area.

The Congress recognized the Agency's need for a headquarters building by authorizing (69 Stat. 349) \$46 million for its construction (together with \$8.5 million for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from its present terminus at Spout Run to a point near Langley in Fairfax County, Va., if the Agency finally selected the Bureau of Public Roads property as the building site).

The Congress initially appropriated (69 Stat. 453) \$5.5 million, with the understanding, as communicated to the Agency, that \$3 million of this sum was for the preparation of detailed plans and specifications for the headquarters installation, and \$2.5 million for acquiring right-of-way and initiating construction of the parkway.

At the time this appropriation was considered, the Congress expressed a wish that the Agency restudy carefully the site location of such a building. To meet this request the Agency engaged Clarke & Rapuano, a firm of consulting engineers and landscape architects of outstanding reputation in this field, to survey all the available sites and recommend the one best suited for the Agency's purpose. Their study resulted in a strong recommendation of a portion of the property presently occupied by the Bureau of Public Roads at Langley, Va. The Agency approved this recommendation and, as required by law, proposed it for consideration by the National Capital Planning Commission.

The National Capital Regional Planning Council and the National Capital Planning Commission approved this recommendation on December 5, 1955, and February 3, 1956, respectively. Accordingly, the Agency is proceeding in coordination with the General Services Administration to take all steps necessary to construct a building at the Langley site as rapidly as possible. In coordination with the Public Buildings Service, an architect-engineer contract has been negotiated with the firm of Harrison & Abramovitz. The architects have prepared schematic and diagrammatic drawings of the proposed headquarters installation together with supporting architectural and engineering information, and the Public Buildings Service has prepared the cost analysis and estimate on which this supplemental request is based. We have, therefore, completed the preliminary planning and are ready now to enter the definitive portion of the project.

The congressional authorization of \$46 million was less than the \$50,840,000 originally estimated by the Public Buildings Service to be the sum necessary to construct an office building of sufficient size to accommodate the headquarters of the Agency. Since the previous estimate was prepared by the Public Buildings Service, March 23, 1955, the Engineering News-Record building cost index has increased by 5.72 percent, and the trend continues upward. Current estimates prepared by the Public Buildings Service, with the concurrence of Harrison & Abramovitz, indicate that it would be impossible to construct a suitable office building of adequate size to accommodate the entire headquarters within the present authorization. These current estimates indicate that \$55,980,000 would be required for relatively austere construction and site development. Under the present authorization, a reduction from original plans of 300,000 square feet of net usable space would be required in the building. However, the building proposed will provide space for all of our employees who are now housed in temporary buildings, thus permitting the evacuation of that space so that its demolition will be possible in accordance with Government plans for urban renewal in the District of Columbia, and as required by the act authorizing the building. The total number of buildings occupied by the Agency will be considerably reduced, with resultant benefits. Delay, in addition to perpetuating excessive operating costs, may occasion an appreciable further increase in construction costs, thereby further reducing the space that can be provided with the funds available.

In considering the nature of the installation, a complete survey was made with the architect-engineer of the special requirements of the Central Intelligence Agency. The unusual security needs of this Agency make mandatory a compartmentation of personnel greatly in excess of that normally required in Government or private office buildings. Special arrangements must be made for secure handling in storage and transmission of large amounts of classified material. Provision must be made for the installation and effective use of special electronic equipment used in the analysis of intelligence data. Finally, the Agency desires a building which, while without frills, will provide a working atmosphere for its employees which will be pleasant and conducive to maximum production. Considering all of these factors, as well as the physical characteristics of the site, the firm of Harrison & Abramovitz has recommended a building consisting of block-type wings as most satisfactorily meeting all the special and unusual requirements of the Agency.

Security factors in the new building

Located on a 125-acre tract forming an inconspicuous part of a larger 750-acre Government reservation, the Langley site was chosen as the one location, among many sites inspected in detail, most adequate for safeguarding the security of CIA's operations and for conducting those operations with the greatest measure of economy and efficiency consistent with security consideration. This site, with its isolation, topography, and heavy forestation, permits both economical construction and an added measure of security safeguards. It is efficiently located with respect to overcoming rush-hour traffic conditions, and it permits rapid access to the White House, the National Security Council, and the State and Defense Departments, with which the bulk of CIA day-to-day coordination activities are concerned.

The general arrangement and layout of the office space in the new building have been designed with security considerations primarily in mind. The new building will consist of block-type wings, readily compartmented from one another, so that specially restricted areas can be established and special security controls maintained in each section, with a degree of flexibility not otherwise practicable. In this building pattern, certain types of services common to the entire Agency will also be housed in separately enclosed sections, but near the center of the building, conveniently available to all points in the building. Still other activities will be set aside in special controlled areas for receiving applicants, trainees, contacts, and other categories of visitors.

The proposed construction will permit a number of special facilities to be installed, protected, and maintained in separate sections of the building. Many of these special facilities will be simply reinstalled from their present scattered locations into the new building; others will represent special communication, storage, and protective devices that will be built into the building in the course of construction.

Economy and efficiency factors in the new building

While security considerations have dominated the general design and technical details of the new building, there are also many economies that will result from housing the Agency in a single, efficiently planned installation. The estimated savings outlined last year to the Congress by CIA have been recomputed in recent days, in the light of the experience of the past 12 months, and have been found again to be as valid as before, with slight variations up or down on particular items. The present high cost of guard forces, reception staffs, shuttle-bus operation and use, and interbuilding couriers will be substantially reduced. Telephone and telephone mileage charges, building service officers, rents, alteration and moving costs are other elements of expense that will be drastically reduced or eliminated altogether. Time lost in shuttling between buildings will be eliminated, with a saving of over \$600,000 annually, aside from the saving in bus operation and maintenance. There will be increased efficiency in the processing of intelligence information not readily measurable in monetary terms.

In addition, the generally austere architectural design of the proposed building assures a further measure of savings which would not be possible if the new building were located in the heart of the Nation's Capital, where there are special artistic demands for expensive, monumental-type public buildings with ornamental embellishments. The long experience and outstanding reputation of the firm of Harrison & Abramovitz in the design of large office buildings provide an assurance of good design and sound construction.

Obligations

The estimated obligations during fiscal year 1956 have been substantially decreased from the amounts shown in budget document, due to the delays incident to the selection of a site.

Urgency

Since last July, when the Congress authorized a new headquarters building for CIA, the progress toward the realization of a secure and economical building has been steady and continuous in virtually all aspects of the necessarily complicated preliminary planning required.

We cannot proceed much further, however, unless additional funds are available for obligation. Not until the building is completed can the Agency vacate temporary structures, which would permit their demolition. Even while the architect is completing detailed plans, we can proceed with necessary preliminary activity—if the funds are available. This will be a construction project of considerable magnitude. Provisions must be made for adequate access to the site; for parking facilities for the several thousand construction workers who will be involved; for preparation of the site to allow the construction of foundations and to provide stockpile areas for construction materials. Additional right-of-way must be acquired for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and its extension must be commenced so that it will provide access to the site. The net result of taking these steps would be to bring that much closer the day when the building will finally be ready for occupancy. In view of all the security advantages and the savings in money, manpower, and operating efficiency resulting from completion of this project, every day lost in breaking ground and proceeding with construction is a costly one.

The urgency that funds be immediately available for obligation cannot be over-emphasized.

It is therefore requested that the Congress appropriate \$49 million, constituting the balance of the funds presently authorized, in order that the construction may proceed without interruption.

HEADQUARTERS BUILDING, CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, LANGLEY, VA.

PROJECT: NEW BUILDING, \$46 MILLION

Building: Consisting of block-type wings and cafeteria; 2 wings, basement, ground, and 5 stories; other wings, ground and 5 stories; cafeteria ground and 1 story; auditorium, one story. All wings to have mechanical penthouses as required. Construction, reinforced concrete and spread footings; exterior, face brick and concrete, stone trim at main entrance only; projected steel sash with DSA glass, no screens. Ceilings, generally, suspended acoustic plaster; fixed partitions for corridors, concrete masonry units; finish, plaster on masonry units and painted masonry units; air-conditioning, all weather; lighting, surface mounted fluorescent fixtures; asphalt tile floor generally; movable partitions, wire stud with gypsum lath and plaster. Laboratory areas include no furniture and equipment.

Total gross areas, exclusive of boiler plant	sq. ft.	1,845,000
Volume: Approximately	cu. ft.	24,200,000

Net area:

Agency space	sq. ft.	1,135,000
Cafeteria	do	55,000
Custodial, etc.	do	45,000
		<hr/> 1,235,000

Estimate

Building construction, including air conditioning	\$34,405,000
Elevators	1,500,000
	<u>35,905,000</u>
Boiler and air conditioning plant	1,800,000
Mechanical distribution	200,000
Outside utilities, water tank and fire lines	255,000
Special requirements	1,285,000
Emergency generator	500,000
Roads, parking, and site development	1,635,000
Reservations	228,000
Contingencies	1,692,000
General expenses:	
Drawings and specifications	\$2,040,000
Supervision	360,000
Office expense	100,000
	<u>2,500,000</u>
Total estimated cost	<u>46,000,000</u>

Special requirements

Robertson floor system, in part	\$150,000
Pneumatic tube	350,000
Nitrate film storage	35,000
ADT system	200,000
Auditorium	150,000
Laboratory space	200,000
Radio and microwave antennas	50,000
3 incinerators and chute (security)	105,000
Private elevator	45,000
Total	<u>1,285,000</u>

Estimated cost of the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from its present terminus to the site to the CIA building near Langley, Va.

Grading (2 40-foot roadways):	<i>Total</i>
Spout Run to Chain Bridge (2.7 miles)	\$1,230,500
Chain Bridge to Langley (3.3 miles)	1,528,000
Total grading	<u>2,758,500</u>

Structures:

Spout Run Bridge:	
High level	402,300
Low level	86,300
Windy Run Bridge	546,000
Donaldson Run Bridge	574,700
Gulf Branch Bridge	517,200
Glebe Rd. overpass	459,800
Pimmit Run Bridge	510,400
Virginia Route 123 underpass	459,800
Langley grade separation	363,200

Total structures 3,919,700

Paving (2 24-foot reinforced concrete roadways):

Spout Run to Chain Bridge (2.7 miles)	594,800
Chain Bridge to Langley (3.3 miles)	727,000

Total paving 1,321,800

Total construction	8,000,000
Land acquisition and miscellaneous	500,000

Total 8,500,000

Mr. MAHON. The committee will come to order.

This morning we are to consider a construction project, a building for the Central Intelligence Agency near Washington.

Mr. Director, we are pleased to have you and members of your staff here. We would be pleased to have a general statement in regard to the proposed request for these funds. Will you proceed in your own way?

GENERAL STATEMENT

Mr. DULLES. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I have with me this morning from the CIA Mr. White, our Deputy in Charge of Support and Administration; Mr. Norman Paul, my legislative assistant; [redacted] who is Chief of the Building Planning Section of our Agency; and Mr. Saunders, our Comptroller.

The Public Buildings Service is represented here by Mr. Poorman, Mr. Hunter and Mr. Palmer, who have been working very closely with us on this project.

Mr. Wallace Harrison and Mr. Max Abramovitz, our architects, are here; and also Mr. Michael Rapuano, who has been advising us on traffic matters and on landscaping and approaches to the building and matters of that nature.

PRESENT FACILITIES

For several years, Mr. Chairman, the Central Intelligence Agency, in cooperation with the General Services Administration, has been seeking to provide a central headquarters building to accommodate its personnel, presently housed in 34 buildings widely scattered throughout the city of Washington. Most or a great many of them are temporary buildings which, as you well know, are in the area where bridges and other developments may come in. In any event, those temporary buildings are in a very disreputable condition at the present time.

AUTHORIZATION

More than a year ago, based upon the determination that there was no existing permanent structure adequate or suitable to Agency needs, authorization was requested of Congress to construct a permanent office building in or near the District of Columbia to house agency personnel stationed in the Washington area.

The Congress recognized the Agency's need for a headquarters building by authorizing, under title IV of the Military Construction Act of 1955, 69 Statutes 349, \$46 million for the construction of this building, together with \$8.5 million for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from its present terminus at Spout Run to a point near Langley in Fairfax County, Va., if the Agency finally selected the Bureau of Public Roads property on the Langley site.

APPROPRIATION

The Congress initially appropriated, in chapter III of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956, 69 Statutes 453, \$5.5 million, with the understanding that \$3 million of this sum was for the preparation of detailed plans and specifications for the headquarters installation,

and \$2.5 million for acquiring right-of-way and initiating construction of the parkway.

At the time this appropriation was considered, the Congress expressed a wish that the Agency restudy carefully the site location of the building. To meet this request the Agency engaged Clarke and Rapuano, a firm of consulting engineers and landscape architects of outstanding reputation in this field, to survey all the available sites and recommend the one best suited for the Agency's purpose. There is a map available which shows the various sites which were considered by Messrs. Clarke and Rapuano.

(The map was presented to the committee.)

Our authorization and appropriation were obtained with the clear understanding that while we were exempted from dispersal we would at the same time definitely not locate in the District of Columbia but, rather, on the fringe of the metropolitan area of Greater Washington. That was after a good deal of consultation, having in mind traffic problems and congestion here in the District.

CRITERIA FOR SITE SELECTION

Messrs. Clarke and Rapuano were given the following additional criteria to guide in their selection.

The new headquarters of the agency should be within a radius of 10 miles and within 20 minutes by automobile from the Zero Milestone in the city of Washington.

The size of the building and the number of automobiles to be parked in its immediate vicinity would require an area of not less than 100 acres.

Approximately 2.3 million square feet of building floor space will be required and it will be necessary to provide space to park approximately 4,000 automobiles, and adequate means for ingress and egress for automobile traffic.

The site should lend itself to ease in carrying out the security measures that are imperative for the agency.

The new headquarters should have ease of communication by road to the White House, to the Pentagon, and to the offices of the Department of State.

LOCATION OF PROPOSED SITE

The study of Messrs. Clarke and Rapuano resulted in a strong recommendation that we select a portion of the property presently occupied by the bureau of public roads at Langley, Virginia. There is an aerial photograph of that site, which we have there. That shows the site and the proposed outline of the building on the site.

Mr. MAHON. Is the green over there the river?

Mr. DULLES. That is the river there [indicating].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Where is the Chain Bridge Road, for instance?

[REDACTED] This red line on the aerial photograph.

Mr. MAHON. Where would you turn right on the Chain Bridge Road, if you were going out to Highway 7, or whatever the number is? Where is that right turn just after you leave Chain Bridge?

[REDACTED] This is Chain Bridge [indicating], sir, and you would turn right. That is not Route 7.

Mr. MAHON. Whatever route it is.

Mr. DULLES. Route 123.

Mr. MAHON. Then it is to the right as you proceed on that road?

[redacted] Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it beyond the top of the hill?

[redacted] Yes, sir. This is approximately 3 miles.

Mr. MAHON. Approximately 3 miles from Chain Bridge to the site?

[redacted] To this Langley intersection. About 2½ miles back to this point [indicating].

Mr. POORMAN. Those public roads buildings are visible. They show up on the aerial photograph.

Mr. MILLER. What is that island right north there?

[redacted] These are Ruppert Island and Sycamore Island.

Mr. DULLES. You will recall up at Langley where the road forks and one goes along the river and one comes into McLean. You will see where the property is.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Just before you get to the fork?

Mr. DULLES. Just before you get to that fork.

[redacted] This is the Langley fork shown on this photograph [indicating].

Mr. DULLES. That map shows the whole public roads property. The black shaded part is the part we would take over.

Mr. MILLER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

REASONS FOR CHOICE OF SITE

Mr. DULLES. When the George Washington Memorial Parkway is in you would have a parkway all the way from our site to the Pentagon. Of course, there is a parkway to the Memorial Bridge, with ready access to the White House, the State Department, and other Government buildings, where people with whom we have to deal are located. We have to deal with them on a daily and hourly basis.

It was desirable also to have the agency headquarters situated on the west side of the Potomac in order to conform with emergency measures that have already been taken.

I might add, off the record—

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. DULLES. Located on a 125-acre tract forming an inconspicuous part of a larger 750-acre Government reservation, the Langley site was chosen as the one location, among many sites inspected in detail, most adequate for safeguarding the security of CIA's operations and for conducting those operations with the greatest measure of economy and efficiency consistent with security considerations. This site, with its isolation, topography and heavy forestation, permits both economical construction and an added measure of security safeguards. It is efficiently located with respect to overcoming rush hour traffic conditions, and it permits rapid access to the White House, the National Security Council, and the State and Defense Departments, with which the bulk of CIA day-to-day coordination activities are concerned.

I would like, if I may, Mr. Chairman, to at this point make a part of the record—I would not burden you with reading it now—the major points contained in the Clarke and Rapuano report, submitted to us.

Mr. MAHON. All right.

(The information is as follows:)

BRIEF OF PRIMARY FACTORS CONTAINED IN CLARKE AND RAPUANO REPORT

The Clarke and Rapuano report proposes that approximately 140 acres of the 750-acre Government-owned property at Langley be used as a site for the new CIA headquarters building.

A major factor considered was the accessibility of the site to the several official departments and agencies with which we are in daily contact. These departments and agencies are located generally in the northwest District of Columbia and adjacent Virginia area.

The development of 140 acres of this 750-acre Government-owned tract for CIA will be such that a wide belt of forest land will be left around the periphery in a manner aiding to provide the desired security. Building on this admirably suited site can be accomplished without changing its park-like character. As the Langley site is already owned by the Federal Government it is unnecessary to acquire additional property or to take additional properties from the tax rolls. If expansion should become necessary, adjacent Government-owned property would presumably be available.

The largest number of our employees (over 68 percent) presently reside in Washington and adjacent Maryland. The Langley site is very convenient to the residences of a large portion of this majority. The CIA located at Langley would not impose serious problems of new population in the community because the larger number of CIA employees could and would continue to live in their present residences. Additional commercial developments need not result from locating CIA headquarters at Langley because this majority of employees, as well as some Virginia residents, will enter the property via the George Washington Memorial Parkway. The parkway will be situated on park lands north of the CIA site or on the opposite side of the property from the Langley area.

To effect the minimum burden of CIA traffic on downtown Washington and the Pentagon area, our preferred site should be in the northwest quadrant of the greater Washington area. To locate the CIA at Langley would help solve the most difficult problem of averting further traffic congestion in a congested part of Washington.

The only highway and bridge improvements necessary to accommodate CIA traffic to and from the Langley site are as follows:

1. Extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway on the Virginia side of the Potomac from its present terminus at Spout Run to the Langley site. Congress has authorized \$8.5 million and approved an appropriation of \$2.5 million in the Agency's building legislation to accomplish this construction if the Langley site is chosen.
2. Planned improvements to Key Bridge. A contract has been awarded by the District of Columbia for the planned Key Bridge improvements and construction is expected to begin in January 1956.
3. Widening of Route 123 to four lanes from its intersection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway to Route 193 beyond Langley. The Department of Highways, State of Virginia, has agreed to finance and complete this construction concurrently with construction of the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

These three improvements, which will ultimately be required whether or not the CIA is located at Langley, will provide a satisfactory access to the proposed site now. The traffic situation at Langley will gain further superiority as the already planned arterial system in this general area takes form, especially the outer loop freeway and the bridge at or near Cabin John, which would make this site ideal. The cost of these and other road improvements in this area which have been planned, scheduled, or contemplated, however, definitely should not be attached to the CIA project. It is highly improbable that there are sites in Virginia other than the Langley site to which a satisfactory situation would obtain without highway construction cost in excess of the estimated cost of the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

Water and sewer services have been guaranteed by the local jurisdictions at no capital cost to the Federal Government. The same situation holds true for commercially furnished utilities such as power, telephone, and public transportation. For all utilities, CIA would merely pay the customary charges for services rendered.

APPROVAL OF AREA PLANNING BODIES

Mr. DULLES. The Agency approved the recommendations of Clarke and Rapuano and, as required by law, proposed this site for consideration by the National Capital Planning Commission. The National Regional Planning Council and the National Capital Planning Commission approved the Langley site on December 5, 1955, and February 3, 1956, respectively.

There was a bit of a battle over that. I do not want to leave with you the impression that that was unanimously adopted. The vote was 5 to 3 in the Regional Planning Council and 7 to 5 in the National Capital Planning Commission.

Mr. MAHON. It would seem to raise some doubt, since there were so many negative voices in these decisions. It looks like there would have been more unanimity.

Mr. DULLES. We think there would have been a good deal of doubt on almost any site. There were divergent interests involved. There would have been that on any site we chose outside of the District. For various reasons, with which you are familiar, I think, we felt it was necessary to choose outside of the District.

Mr. MAHON. In other words, you think perhaps the complaint over the Langley site is no greater and perhaps less than it would have been at any other site, had it been selected?

Mr. DULLES. No, I would not say less than at any other site. There was some feeling on the part of the people there. I think that has been largely overcome by now, and I do not look forward to any great difficulty. There may be one or two protestants who will present their views to you.

LOCAL OPPOSITION

Mr. MAHON. I understand there is someone who is to appear before us today who has the signatures of 700 unhappy people.

Mr. WHITE. Sir, the County Board of Supervisors of Fairfax County unanimously voted on three occasions, I believe, and officially endorsed the action of coming out there. There was another petition circulated by people who did want us to come out there, at the same time this petition of 700 was circulated. On that petition there were about 2,600 names, as compared with the 700, who did endorse our coming out there.

However, I think the popular opinion of the people is best reflected in a poll which Congressman Broyhill conducted, because this was in his district, to try to determine what the real wishes of the people were. In that poll about 73.3 percent of the people responded favorably to our locating there. That 73.3 percent, I think, is an excellent sample, because the percentage of returns he received from his questionnaire was almost identical to the number of voters who voted in the referendum which they had not too long ago.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You mean 73.3 percent of those responding were in favor of this?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Or 73.3 percent was the total of the population responding?

Mr. WHITE. 73.3 percent of those responding were in favor, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How many responded?

Mr. WHITE. I have the statistics on that, sir.

Mr. MILLER. What was the area he polled? Was that Fairfax County? In other words, what population did the poll cover?

Mr. WHITE. It was Fairfax County. His questionnaire included both the Burke Airport and this installation.

Mr. DULLES. But they were different questions.

Mr. WHITE. Different questions.

Mr. MILLER. It was sent to everybody in Fairfax County?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir; 73.3 percent of the questionnaires returned were in favor of it, and the people in the Dranesville district, in which this is located, who would be most affected, were even in favor of it in a higher percentage than the county as a whole.

Mr. MAHON. You mean the people located nearest to the proposed site were the strongest in favor of it?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir. The Fairfax County Planning Commission has also very strongly endorsed the location at this particular site.

This group of people, which is a very small group of people, who have the 700 signatures, are very definitely a small minority. They have been very vocal and very effective, but there is no question that they are a very small minority.

Mr. DULLES. Mr. Chairman, they would like to see no change at all. They do not want the road built. They would not want anything of that kind. They do not say that, but it is in my opinion a fact.

NEED FOR PARKWAY

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You would have to change that road to make this practical, would you not?

Mr. DULLES. Oh, yes. Without the George Washington Memorial Parkway it would be utterly impractical. That is an absolutely inevitable development, I think, of the city of Washington. I do not think that there is any possibility that that road will not be built. It has been on the statute books for 25 years.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You would have to have that and you would have to have improvements to Key Bridge and the widening of Route 123 to make this practical?

Mr. DULLES. We do need the widening of Route 123 from the Langley fork to the parkway. Key Bridge is being improved now.

Mr. MAHON. You were making a very interesting statement, Mr. White. Why do you not continue?

POLL OF AREA RESIDENTS

Mr. WHITE. I have statistics here. Let me read them, to make sure the record is correct.

Congressman Broyhill's poll indicated that 73.3 percent of all the voters of Fairfax County favor locating CIA at Langley, with only 17.9 percent opposing it, and 8.8 percent having no opinion.

It is also significant that each of the 7 magisterial districts heavily favor locating CIA at Langley and in the Dranesville district, which includes Langley, the voters favored this site by 1,789 votes for, to 517 against.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is that the total response to the poll, 1,789 plus 517?

Mr. WHITE. That is just the Dranesville district, sir, which is the district most affected.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You do not have the overall figure representing the number of responses?

Mr. WHITE. I do have it, sir, but I do not have it with me.

Mr. MAHON. I think that is a remarkably comprehensive poll, as polls go.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It depends on whether 100 replied, or 5,000.

Mr. MAHON. I know, but in the district where the site is to be located the people voted in large numbers and the majority of them favor it. I think in this case it is significant that the people in the area want it.

Mr. WHITE. In the area it is 1,789 for and 517 against. In every magisterial district it was strongly in favor of the Langley site. I can get those statistics from Mr. Broyhill's office, for the total. I will have them shortly.

The Broyhill poll was sent to 35,286 registered voters in Fairfax County. 10,505 of those polled responded to this questionnaire.

As I said, this is about the same percentage that voted in the referendum out there, so the statistics I gave you earlier are based on 10,505 voters, or a little more than 30 percent.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Thank you.

ACCESS TO SITE

Mr. DULLES. On the question of access to the site, Mr. Chairman, in its affirmative report the National Capital Planning Commission stated that it and the regional council were in general agreement that certain highway improvements would:

Need to be programed at an earlier date to accommodate the traffic volumes generated by the installation.

Citing specifically—and I will go over the various points—

The George Washington Memorial Parkway from Spout Run to Langley. On that we are in complete agreement.

The widening to four lanes of Route 123 from Langley fork to Chain Bridge. That has been promised by the State of Virginia. Planning, I think, is already underway for that.

Mr. WHITE. Just from the Langley fork to the intersection of the Parkway is committed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. What are you going to do after you cross Chain Bridge? You will have a bottleneck there; will you not?

Mr. DULLES. We will show you the figures on that. I do not think you will. As you see, where our people are located and the routes they will use, and the fact that the traffic on Chain Bridge at the time our people would be going out is in the other direction, has an effect. There is very little traffic over Chain Bridge going out in the morning. It is almost all coming in.

The widening to four lanes of Glebe Road from Lee Highway to Chain Bridge.

Mr. MAHON. Glebe Road in that area is a horrible thing.

Mr. DULLES. That would be useful, but it is not necessary immediately for our people, because there will not be many of our people using Glebe Road.

The widening to four lanes of Chain Bridge. That we think also would be desirable but not essential.

Improvements to Canal Road and Weaver Place in the District of Columbia (Chain Bridge approaches).

Mr. MAHON. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. DULLES. The next point is the construction of the Cabin John Bridge and adjoining segments of the outer circumferential loop. That is also something I think is inevitable in the very near future.

Mr. MAHON. That is a highway across the river there?

Mr. DULLES. Yes, sir; the proposed Cabin John Bridge.

Mr. MAHON. How far is that from Chain Bridge?

It would be about 3 miles, sir, it is about 6 miles from Key Bridge.

Mr. DULLES. Route 240 is coming in from Maryland.

Mr. POORMAN. That has been a part of the planned highway system for a great while. It was recently relocated, not because of anything happening here. This is the last proposed location for that.

Mr. DULLES. The highway improvements proposed have been planned, as stated, for a long time. Our consultants agree that their ultimate development would increase the convenience of access to the Langley site; in fact, their prospective construction is one of the reasons we prefer the Langley site to the other sites. We believe that many of these improvements may more properly be considered under the President's highway construction program, however, than as adjuncts to the CIA building.

We believe that the projected immediate extension of the parkway, and the widening of a portion of Route 123 to which the State of Virginia is committed, will provide adequate access to the Langley site without overburdening other existing facilities.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The State of Virginia is committed to both roads?

Mr. DULLES. No. The George Washington Memorial Parkway will be done under appropriations that will be requested, \$2.5 million of which have already been granted.

Mr. MAHON. Has anything been done about that construction?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DULLES. They are acquiring rights-of-way rapidly.

Mr. WHITE. The right-of-way is being acquired and the Bureau of Public Roads has its plans ready to award a contract for grading.

Mr. DULLES. We have made available to the committee staff a memorandum covering the financing of the proposed road improvements and construction of the parkway and Route 123.

(The information is as follows:)

ROAD CONSTRUCTION TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL ACCESS TO THE LANGLEY SITE

1. *George Washington Memorial Parkway.*—The Congress recognized the need for additional access to the Langley site by providing, in the legislation authorizing the construction of a headquarters installation for the Central Intelligence Agency, \$8,500,000 for the extension of the parkway from its present terminus at Spout Run to a point north of the site. The National Capital Planning Commission, the National Park Service, and the Bureau of Public Roads are all concerned in parkway development. These agencies are substantially advanced in their planning for the construction. Surveys, appraisals, and right-of-way acquisition for a portion of the route have begun.

(a) *Arlington County.*—A tripartite agreement (United States, Virginia, Arlington County) was completed on June 17, 1950, providing for a contribution of \$600,000 (one-half by the United States, one-fourth each by the State and

county) for the acquisition of right-of-way. Currently, a portion of this right-of-way has been acquired: 2 condemnation suits are underway, and 3 additional parcels will be subjected to condemnation in the near future. This will complete initial steps of acquisition for all required right-of-way within Arlington County, except for one parcel which straddles the Arlington-Fairfax line. Of the original contribution, \$196,540.60 remains unexpended and unobligated, but may well be required for the completion of land acquisition. Construction cost estimates for this portion of the parkway total \$5,147,000 (grading, \$1,380,500; paving, \$669,800; structures, \$3,096,700).

(b) *Fairfax County*.—A tripartite agreement was completed on July 27, 1955, providing for a contribution of \$200,000 (in the same proportion as above). No expenditures or obligations have been incurred against these funds to date. This amount covers acquisition of right-of-way from the Arlington-Fairfax line to Route 123. An agreement is yet to be reached covering acquisitions from 123 north to the Langley site. For this purpose the National Capital Planning Commission has available funds in the amount of \$150,000, the State of Virginia has available \$118,500, and the current budget of Fairfax County provides for \$75,000. Construction cost estimates for this portion of the parkway total \$2,853,000 (grading, \$1,387,000; paving, \$652,000; structures, \$823,000).

Under the organic legislation of the National Capital Planning Commission Federal funds contributed to the acquisition of right-of-way may not exceed 50 percent of the cost; the balance must be supplied by the local jurisdictions concerned. Both the State and county have available allocated but uncommitted funds for additional contribution. The construction cost, as estimated above, totals \$8 million. The remaining \$500,000 requested is for additional Federal contributions toward land-acquisition cost, if this should be required, and to meet contingencies in parkway construction.

2. *Virginia Route 123*.—The Virginia State Department of Highways has committed itself to widening Route 123 to four lanes from its intersection with the parkway to Langley Fork (intersection of Routes 123 and 193). The total cost of this construction has been estimated by the department at \$300,000. For this purpose the department allocated \$100,000 in fiscal 1955 and \$200,000 in fiscal 1956, which remains unexpended. Virginia intends eventually to widen 123 to a four-lane dual highway all the way to Chain Bridge, but no firm date has been established for the accomplishment of this intention; it would probably be related to any projected increase in the capacity of Chain Bridge. The survey of the committed portion has been completed and the Department expects to start planning within the next 30 to 60 days. They estimate that plans can be completed by the spring of 1957, and that construction contracts can be let shortly thereafter.

BRIDGE TRAFFIC

Mr. DULLES. The key to access to the Langley site is the ability to move traffic across the river. The chart of Potomac River crossings demonstrates that adequate capacity exists for CIA traffic to and from Langley, especially since at the rush hours Agency traffic will be moving counter to the general flow. Location of the Agency at Langley will, in fact, remove an estimated 1,000 cars from the dominant flow of rush-hour traffic across the Potomac at the present time.

(The chart is as follows:)

Traffic count for Potomac River highway bridges

Hours	Chain		Key		Memorial		Highway		Total	
	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out
7 a. m. to 8 a. m.	1,502	1,199	2,558	2,058	3,508	1,823	5,099	5,166	12,667	4,514
8 a. m. to 9 a. m.	1,114	1,804	2,379	2,367	4,050	2,349	5,118	2,033	12,681	7,883
4 p. m. to 5 p. m.	562	1,042	2,193	1,324	3,342	3,244	5,257	4,599	11,354	10,569
5 p. m. to 6 p. m.	469	1,504	1,894	2,639	2,794	4,464	5,152	5,555	10,309	14,162
Rated capacity	1,500	1,500	3,750	3,750	4,200	4,200	6,000	5,100	16,450	14,550

NOTE.— Italic figures indicate unused capacity. Total unused capacity, 7 a. m. to 9 a. m., 12,497; total unused capacity, 4 p. m. to 6 p. m., 9,237. Roosevelt Bridge estimated capacity, 4,500 per hour.
1 Includes present expansion.

Source: Bureau of Public Roads data, September 1955.

I will ask [] to explain this chart to you.

[] We have indicated on the chart the four bridges; Chain, Key, Memorial, and Highway Bridge. We have given the rated capacities of each of the bridges, both into Washington and out.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Where is the Highway Bridge?

[] This [indicating] is the Highway Bridge.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Where is that?

[] The Highway Bridge is otherwise known as the 14th Street Bridge, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Thank you.

[] This is the Memorial Bridge [indicating]. This is the Key Bridge [indicating].

The figures include the Key Bridge improvements that are being accomplished at this time, scheduled for completion early next year.

Chain Bridge has a rated capacity in each direction—of 1,500 cars an hour. The Bureau of Public Roads data as of the September 1955 traffic count indicates that between 7 and 8 o'clock in the morning into town the bridge is at capacity, 1,502 cars per hour; while at the same time in an outgoing direction only 301 cars use the bridge leaving a balance of 1,199 cars in that direction.

The same count has been taken from 8 until 9 o'clock, and we find that there are 1,144 cars entering the District, and 296 cars outbound.

The same calculations have been made on the Key Bridge, and we find that we have a potential capacity on Key Bridge in an outgoing direction, in the morning, between 7 and 8, of 2,058, and between 8 and 9 of 2,367 cars.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Those are estimates?

[] These are estimates based on the Bureau of Public Roads Data.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thought you said Key Bridge was included in the improvements.

[] That is correct, sir. There is a lane being added in each direction which we have included in these traffic estimates.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. When will that be completed?

[] Early next year, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Calendar year?

[] Yes, sir.

Mr. DULLES. Memorial Bridge is the same.
I think we can move along.

[] At the Highway Bridge we find it to be at capacity in the morning in an outgoing direction. In fact, it is 66 cars overloaded between 8 and 9.

Taking the totals between the hours of 7 to 9 in the morning we find a potential of 12,497 cars in an outgoing direction. We have applied the same analysis for the hours of 4 to 6 in the afternoon, coming back into the District, and we find that we have a 9,237 car potential below the capacities of the bridges.

Figuring that we would stagger our hours in the morning and evening we would benefit by the potential of the combined river crossing of Chain, Key, Memorial, and Highway Bridges.

We do not have on this chart the capacity of the Roosevelt Island or Constitution Avenue Bridge or Tunnel, whichever it may be.

EMPLOYEES RESIDENCES DISTRIBUTION

Mr. MAHON. Would this site, when developed and occupied, not tend to cause people to buy property and build homes in the vicinity of the Langley site, and would you not thereby reduce some of your figures?

Mr. DULLES. Some of that would take place, undoubtedly, in time. We would like to show you where our people live now. That would give you a general clue. We have a good many already living in Virginia.

(The chart referred to is as follows:)

Employee's Residences Distribution

	Percent
Northwest Washington, D. C.-----	37
Arlington County, Va.-----	15
Montgomery County, Md.-----	11
Alexandria, Va.-----	8
Fairfax County, Va.-----	8
Prince Georges County, Md.-----	7
Southeast Washington, D. C.-----	7
Northeast Washington, D. C.-----	5
Southwest Washington, D. C.-----	1
Other locations-----	1

If you take that chart [indicating] you see that we have 31 percent who would not have to cross any bridge at all, because they are already in Virginia. These on the right [indicating], 20 percent, would presumably use the Highway Bridge or Memorial Bridge. A large part of the 37 percent would find Key Bridge probably more convenient than the Chain Bridge and Memorial Bridge.

The idea that we are going to swamp Chain Bridge is, I think, not realistic.

Undoubtedly more will move, in time. That land right near our site is pretty expensive land. I do not think they would move there. They would go out further, toward McLean, in that direction. I think that is true; I think there would be some minor movement into Virginia.

ADEQUACY OF AREA OF SITE

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, in connection with that same thought—commercial enterprise and dwellings and so forth being located near

this site—I am wondering if they have ample protection in regard to the site chosen, and so far as they can see in the foreseeable future they will not need any additional land.

Mr. MAHON. That is a good question.

Mr. DULLES. Mr. Riley, you see, there are 750 acres in this tract. We could not assure you that we would never need more of that. Part of that will be taken up by the highway, but the Government owns 750 acres as shown on that whole plot.

Mr. RILEY. I notice on the map that there is a square in between the narrow neck shown and the Government-owned land. What protection do you have there?

Mr. WHITE. Sir, that is Government-owned land.

Mr. RILEY. It is?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir. When that property was deeded to the Government a provision was made permitting two ladies, the right to live on and occupy that property for their lifetime. It is Government property now, with that stipulation.

Mr. RILEY. In other words, there is no division on the neck shown and the other Government land?

Mr. WHITE. No, sir. You can see it better on this photograph, sir [indicating].

Mr. RILEY. That will eventually come to the Government?

Mr. DULLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLER. That is now Government-owned subject to two life estates; is that the situation?

Mr. DULLES. That is correct.

Mr. MAHON. All right. Proceed.

FACILITIES REQUIRED

Mr. DULLES. All needed facilities, adequate to CIA's needs, have been promised by the public authorities or public utilities concerned. For each of them the Government will pay installation and service charges at the going rates like any other customer.

Water will be supplied by the city of Falls Church.

Sewage disposal will be supplied by Fairfax County.

Telephone, electric light and power will be supplied by public utility corporations serving the area.

Public transportation will be supplied by the bus lines serving the general area, as may be determined by the Virginia State Corporation Commission.

BUILDING PLANS

Now we come to the building. In coordination with the Public Buildings Service, an architect-engineer contract has been negotiated with the firm of Harrison & Abramovitz. The architects have prepared a tentative site plan and diagrammatic drawings of the proposed headquarters installation together with supporting architectural and engineering information, and the Public Buildings Service has prepared the cost analysis and estimate on which this request for an additional appropriation is based. We have, therefore, completed the

preliminary planning and are ready now to enter the definitive portion of the project.

In considering the nature of the installation, a complete survey was made by the architect-engineer of the special requirements of the Central Intelligence Agency. The unusual security needs of this agency make mandatory a compartmentation of personnel greatly in excess of that normally required in Government of private office buildings. Special arrangements must be made for secure handling in storage and transmission of large amounts of classified material. Provision must be made for the installation and effective use of special electronic equipment used in the analysis of intelligence data.

Finally, the agency desires a building which, while without frills, will provide a working atmosphere for its employees which will be pleasant and conducive to maximum production. It is a very austere building we have planned, however.

Considering all of these factors, as well as the physical characteristics of the site, the firm of Harrison & Abramovitz has recommended a building consisting of block-type wings as most satisfactorily meeting all the special and unusual requirements of the agency.

The general arrangement and layout of the office space in the new building have been designed with security considerations primarily in mind. The new building will consist of block-type wings, readily compartmented from one another, so that specially restricted areas can be established and special security controls maintained in each section, with a degree of flexibility not otherwise practicable.

(The photograph of the model of the proposed building may be found on facing page.)

MANPOWER SAVINGS ANTICIPATED

Mr. SCRIVNER. May I ask two questions at this point?

Mr. DULLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCRIVNER. They may be out of context.

One of the big arguments which was given to us originally for a new building was that in view of the fact that you are so widely scattered now there is time unduly consumed and a greater number of employees required and all that. How many fewer employees will you be able to get along with with the new building? How many men are you going to save by having this one compact installation instead of scattered throughout the city of Washington?

Mr. DULLES. We will save a great deal in the field of guards, messengers; and we also ought to be able to save in the higher echelon personnel because of the amount of time we will save.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I asked that question 3 or 4 years ago, and I believe the general statement was made that it would save a lot of manpower, which I felt was a general conclusion, and I understood somebody was going to give us some figures on about how many it would save. I knew it would not be enough to make this a self-liquidating project.

Mr. DULLES. It will in time.

Mr. WHITE. Sir, in the dollars it will. We have not estimated with any degree of accuracy as to the actual man-hours that will be saved by higher echelon personnel in traveling between buildings. However, we estimate that we will save about 228 people who are



guards, receptionists, couriers, bus drivers, and so forth, and our efficiency will be greatly increased thereby permitting us to do more with the people we have.

USE OF BUILDING BEFORE ALL CONSTRUCTION IS COMPLETED

Mr. SCRIVNER. The other question is this: You are scattered now throughout a lot of different buildings. Does the building program which you contemplate envision a program under which you will complete certain segments of this and move in, or are you going to wait and move in all in one fell swoop?

Mr. DULLES. We plan to move in all in one fell swoop but, as we will present to you in just a moment, in view of the fact that the authorization was cut down a bit and in view of the increased prices we want to tell you frankly we cannot get all our personnel into this building unless the authorization is increased and the appropriation is increased. We are not asking that at this time.

Mr. SCRIVNER. It would seem possible that in the construction of this building it could be so constructed that as certain portions of it are completed you would be able to move in and get these folks out of these temporary quarters, particularly, so that these buildings could be removed, instead of waiting. If you are going to wait for all of it it will be a matter of years.

Mr. DULLES. I would like to get the views of Mr. Harrison or Mr. Abramovitz on that.

Mr. HARRISON. We could certainly space it over a matter of months.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is not much satisfaction.

Mr. HARRISON. No.

Mr. SCRIVNER. How long will it take to complete the whole thing?

Mr. HARRISON. Three to 3½ years sir.

Mr. SCRIVNER. You do not think you could build it in units, so that you could complete one segment and move in, and then another segment and move in that?

Mr. HARRISON. We could certainly do a lot. Whether it would be as economical to do it that way I do not know, compared to letting one whole contractor do it. That would have to be discussed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. You could still have one contract and have unit completion dates.

Mr. HARRISON. We would have to have plans for the whole thing, sir.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Can you not have unit completion dates, as well as a complete completion date?

Mr. HARRISON. We certainly can. I think we could save a matter of months, but I would hate to say we could save years by that.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Even a matter of months is quite an item.

Mr. HARRISON. We might get up to 9 to 10 months, sir.

Mr. DULLES. We will do our best.

Mr. MAHON. I think, Mr. Director, the idea Mr. Scrivner has presented is worthy of consideration. You might save rent on other buildings.

Mr. DULLES. And permit the destruction of the temporary buildings sooner, which is a very important matter.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, in connection with that I should like to ask a question.

Do you propose to let a contract which would have as an alternate the additional construction you hope to get in your authorization and appropriation, so that all of it can be in one contract?

Mr. POORMAN. I think that would depend, gentlemen, on your reaction to the Director's presentation here. It would be feasible, assuming that favorable action could be expected within a comparatively short period after an award were made.

Mr. RILEY. You would certainly get a better price.

Mr. POORMAN. That is correct.

Mr. RILEY. If you could let the whole thing as one contract, with an alternate provision for extension.

Mr. POORMAN. If it were the consensus of the committee that the chances were good, I believe our conclusion would be to complete the plans and quite conceivably take a bid with an alternate for the addition.

Mr. DULLES. I will go into that cost matter right now, Mr. Chairman, if I may.

Mr. MAHON. Proceed.

Mr. DULLES. I want to say, Mr. Scrivner, that we will give that most careful consideration and see what we can do. It is a good suggestion, and our buildings are falling down now. We want to get out of some of these temporary buildings. They may not last 3 years.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is what you have been telling us all this time. That is why I raised the question why this could not be completed in units or segments, or whatever you want to call it.

Mr. DULLES. Yes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. And as each one is completed move the people in and get them out of these other places. If it is as urgent as has been indicated there is no use waiting until the entire project is completed to move everybody in. If you are widely separated now and can operate you can keep on operating even though you are widely separated out there.

Mr. MAHON. All right. Proceed.

COST

Mr. DULLES. Mr. Chairman, this is the cost situation.

The Public Buildings Service's original estimate, in March 1955, for a building to house our personnel was \$50.8 million.

In our hearings at the Bureau of the Budget this was reduced to \$50 million.

The Congress authorized \$46 million.

Now, on the basis of a concrete project the Public Buildings Service and our architects estimate that we could have a very austere building for \$46 million which would house approximately 87 percent of the people for which we had originally planned.

Construction costs have risen about 5.72 percent during the past 12 months.

The present estimate by the Public Buildings Service and our architects, on the basis of a specific site and specific plans, for a building to meet our needs, is \$56 million.

Including \$8.5 million for the parkway, the total cost would be \$64.5 million as opposed to a total current authorization of \$54.5 million, as is shown in the following charts.

(The charts referred to follow:)

Space requirement, \$46,000,000 building

	<i>Square feet</i>
Net office space	754,650
Reception rooms	7,450
Files (including vaults)	85,300
Storage areas (including vaults)	46,150
Reproduction	25,400
Laboratories	11,450
Class and lecture rooms	26,850
Conference and briefing rooms	34,300
Medical facilities, telephone extensions, communications facilities, etc.	136,550
Net other space	373,450
Cafeteria and custodial space	100,000
Total net space	1,228,100

COST, BUILDING WITH GROSS FLOOR AREA OF 1,845,000 SQUARE FEET

Seven block type wings, ground floor and 5 stories, basement under 2 wings, cafeteria ground and 1 story, auditorium 1 story. Reinforced concrete frame; exterior, face brick and concrete, air conditioned, fluorescent lighting, asphalt tile floors generally, laboratory and shops included.

Estimate

Building (1,845,000 square feet)	\$34,405,000
Elevators	1,500,000
Total	35,905,000
Boiler plant and air-conditioning equipment	1,800,000
Mechanical distribution and utilities	455,000
Roads, parking, site development	1,635,000
Emergency generator	500,000
Special requirements	1,285,000
Contingencies	1,920,000
General expenses	2,500,000
Total	46,000,000

Space requirement, \$55,980,000 building

	<i>Square feet</i>
Net office space	853,350
Reception rooms	7,600
Files (including vaults)	110,300
Storage areas (including vaults)	66,400
Reproduction	86,200
Laboratories	17,900
Class and lecture rooms	59,100
Conference and briefing rooms	39,100
Medical facilities, telephone extension, communications facilities, garage, etc.	210,550
Net other space	597,150
Cafeteria and custodial space	100,000
Total net space	1,550,500

COST, BUILDING WITH GROSS FLOOR AREA OF 2,250,000 SQUARE FEET

Consists of 9 block-type wings, auditorium and cafeteria; ground floor and 5 stories for 9 wings, with basement under 2 wings; cafeteria, ground and 1 story, auditorium, 1 story; concrete frame; exterior, face brick and stone trim; interior

finish, generally, plaster on masonry, air conditioned, fluorescent lighting; laboratory and shops included.

Garage: 1-story brick, steel frame with precast plank roof.

Main building (2,250,000 square feet)-----	\$44,000,000
Elevators-----	1,500,000
Garage-----	230,000
Total-----	45,730,000
Boiler plant and air-conditioning equipment-----	1,800,000
Mechanical distributor and utilities-----	455,000
Roads, parking, site development-----	1,635,000
Emergency generator-----	500,000
Special requirements-----	1,285,000
Contingencies-----	2,075,000
General expenses-----	2,500,000
Total-----	55,980,000

We obtained our authorization and initial appropriation with the expectation that we could get everyone into one building. With present building costs this is not possible. While it is highly desirable to have all of our people in one building, we could operate efficiently with the essential more sensitive elements in one building with less sensitive operations conducted elsewhere, if you deem it is not practical to increase the authorization and appropriation.

Mr. MAHON. If we are going to have the building I would like to say for myself that I want to have it and have an adequate building and have it all done as one job and provide the funds and say to you: "This is it and this will be the only space occupied by the CIA in Washington."

I think that is good practice.

When do you expect to seek this additional authorization?

Mr. DULLES. We thought we would come in in January, at the next session of Congress.

Mr. MAHON. How do you propose to let a contract for this building?

Mr. DULLES. Will you answer that, Mr. White?

Mr. WHITE. Sir, if our requests were acted upon fairly promptly it would be in ample time to let the contract for the whole project, inasmuch as the architect will complete his plans in March of next year. So if we came in in January and the matter was considered at a reasonably early date and a decision definitely would be made as to whether we would let a contract for the \$56 million building or the \$46 million building, there would be time to avoid any waste of money.

NUMBER OF PERSONNEL

Mr. MAHON. You ought to build the building. If you do not have adequate room for all the personnel, maybe you ought to reduce them and work with less personnel.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That was the suggestion I was going to make. We might cut them down, which might be some inducement. I thought they could cut it down substantially.

Mr. MAHON. They might come out and say: "We have our major plant out here, but we are beginning to have activities in other buildings and so we will have X number of other buildings housing the CIA."

I think we have too many people in the CIA already.

Mr. DULLES. We could get rid of all of our buildings, Mr. Chairman, that are of a temporary nature, and just keep 11 permanent buildings.

Mr. WHITE. Sir, in just one minute we have charts to show you on the comparative saving. It certainly is, in our judgment, an uneconomical thing to do, not to build the building, as you suggest; but we will show you those charts in just a minute, sir.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION REQUIRED

Mr. DULLES. We would much prefer to go ahead on the \$46 million rather than have a lot of delays.

Mr. MAHON. Why do you not get a budget request and send it up here and let us approve this business?

Mr. RILEY. At least get the authorization. I concur with the chairman that we should not take this thing piecemeal.

Mr. MAHON. The military construction bill is pending now in the Senate.

Mr. DULLES. We had consultations with the Armed Services Committee, which would be the committee that would consider our authorization, and the general advice we got, though they might very well reconsider it, was that it was better to go ahead with what we have, and then after we have our definite plans and can tell you just exactly how much it is going to cost to come in next year for an additional sum. That is a question of judgment for the Congress rather than for us.

Mr. MAHON. In other words, you propose to get the authorization in time to do the job?

Mr. DULLES. That is right.

Mr. MAHON. Just so you get the authorization in time to do the job.

Mr. DULLES. Then we would have completed plans. We would have a pretty good idea of our construction costs. Then we could come in with something more definite than we have at the present time.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, why could they not get the authorization now, and when they have completed plans and have more or less exact estimates of cost, the Appropriations Committee could make available the necessary funds? You could get your authorization now, so that you would not have any delay.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

TIMING

Mr. MAHON. You expect to get funds at this session of Congress?

Mr. DULLES. We would like to; yes, sir.

Mr. MAHON. For the fiscal year beginning on July 1?

Mr. DULLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAHON. When do you expect to complete your plans?

Mr. DULLES. By next March.

Mr. MAHON. March of 1957?

Mr. DULLES. That is right.

Mr. MAHON. When do you expect to let a contract and obligate your money?

Mr. DULLES. Immediately thereafter.

Mr. POORMAN. We would allow from 45 to 60 days to receive bids and award contracts.

Mr. MAHON. When would you expect to complete the project?

Mr. POORMAN. We might start taking over portions of it in 24 months and run up to 30 months to complete. The Congressman's statement appears to have considerable merit.

Mr. DULLES. We might desire to commit certain additional funds in connection with the road, and push that along prior to the committing of funds for the building.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Ostertag?

AUTHORIZATION REQUIRED

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Dulles, it is not clear to me whether or not you are prepared to ask for full authorization or whether you require additional time in order to develop your plans to determine the full authorization for this project. What is the situation on that?

Mr. DULLES. We would be disposed to ask for that if the advice we received here from the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees was that would be likely to succeed.

Mr. WHITE. The problem is a technical one in that our enabling legislation—

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is the point of my inquiry, the matter of complete authorization.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir. We would propose to ask to have that amended in January. Being limited to \$54½ million now, of which we already have \$5.5 million, we are asking for \$49 million, \$43 million of which is for the building and \$6 million of which is for the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

Then we would propose to ask for an amendment to the authorization in January, and at the same time ask for the appropriation in an approximate amount of \$10 million to complete the whole building.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In other words, you are prepared to ask for the authorization to complete this project now. You are in a position to request it so far as your estimate of requirements is concerned.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir. The estimates which you see on this chart have been made by the Public Buildings Service people and our architects, and the estimate for the total building as of now is \$55,980,000.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The appropriation itself would serve no particular purpose until and unless you obtain the complete authorization anyhow.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is why I raised the question as to whether it might not be wise to follow what appears to be the feeling of this committee, that you expedite the complete authorization.

Mr. DULLES. I would like to do that.

Mr. MAHON. You probably will save a little money doing it that way.

Mr. DULLES. A little money and a little time.

On the other hand, if I should fail in obtaining additional authorization, then I would lose time. Whereas time would be gained by obtaining the \$49 million now.

Mr. WHITE. If we did not have the enabling legislation this year we would be stymied on going ahead with the parkway full speed, and it is also probable that we will want to do some site development on the site because we have a lot of construction work there. It might also be possible to do some foundation work in order to shorten the time.

Regardless of whether we build a \$46 million building or a \$56 million building, we do need money before it is reasonable to expect it to be authorized next year.

Perhaps Mr. Poorman might elaborate on that some.

Mr. POORMAN. With the \$46 million appropriation we would be in a position to go ahead and carry it through and actually advertise and make an award. I feel quite certain we could carry an alternate in the contract for the additions which we could implement within probably 6 months of the time of the award without delaying it, because he could go ahead full steam on the rest of the building. I feel certain that this \$46 million would enable us to go through on a continuous, rapid program without any delays at any stage.

Mr. MAHON. All right, Mr. Dulles.

ESTIMATED SAVINGS

Mr. DULLES. Our plans are based on average net office space utilization per person which is considerably below the governmentwide average of net office space per employee in metropolitan Washington.

If we had to proceed on the basis of the smaller building, it would require a reduction from our total plans of approximately 300,000 square feet of net usable space.

However, on that basis we could get in all of the people now housed in our temporary buildings but not all of our personnel.

There are many economies which, as you have noted, could be effected if we were housed in a single efficiently planned installation, as shown in the following charts.

New building project (on basis of 1 building)

Item	Present costs	Estimated costs in 1 new building	Estimated savings in 1 new building
Guard service.....	\$1, 515, 800	\$651, 800	\$864, 000
Reception staff.....	123, 100	57, 100	66, 000
Shuttle service.....	49, 500		49, 500
Couriers and messengers.....	246, 600	204, 400	42, 200
Telephone mileage charges.....	48, 200		48, 200
Building services officers.....	125, 000	75, 000	50, 000
Rents.....	1 813, 800		1 813, 800
Alterations and moving.....	2 798, 800	300, 000	498, 800
Loss of time.....	747, 000		747, 000
Total.....	4, 464, 800	1, 288, 300	3, 176, 500

¹ Includes \$359,800 present rental costs and \$454,000 for Government-owned buildings.
² Average for fiscal year 1954, 1955, and 1956.

New building project (on basis of 1 new building and 11 buildings in Washington)

Item	Present costs	Estimated costs	Estimated savings
Guard service.....	\$1,515,800	\$937,400	\$578,400
Reception staff.....	123,100	70,100	44,000
Shuttle service.....	46,500	18,500	28,000
Couriers and messengers.....	246,800	266,100	-19,300
Telephone mileage charges.....	48,200	39,200	9,000
Building services officers.....	125,000	139,800	-14,800
Rents.....	¹ 813,800	¹ 813,800	
Alterations and moving.....	² 798,800	447,000	351,800
Loss of time.....	747,000	179,000	568,000
Total.....	4,464,800	2,919,900	1,544,900

¹ Includes \$359,800 present rental costs and \$454,000 for Government-owned buildings.

² A average for fiscal year 1954, 1955 and 1956.

Since last July, when the Congress authorized a new headquarters building for CIA, the progress toward the realization of secure and economical building has been steady and continuous. As indicated, we cannot proceed further unless additional funds are available for obligation.

A good deal of what I have written here has been covered in our discussion.

I would like to request that the Congress appropriate \$49 million constituting the balance of the funds presently authorized in order that the construction may proceed without delay or interruption.

If this is done, as indicated, I would then appear before you in the next Congress and ask for an additional \$10 million in order to build a building to house all of our personnel.

Mr. SCRIVNER. You may have stated this, and you have before us two charts. One shows on the basis of 1 building that you estimate, which is probably optimistic, an annual savings, once you get in the new building, of \$3,176,000 a year, which would on the surface indicate that these savings would amortize the cost of the building in 20 years. As I said, it is probably optimistic.

On the other chart, where you talk about what would happen if you cannot have the additional \$10 million building but would be confined to the one presently authorized, which would be built under present authorization, you would have the 1 new building plus 11 buildings in Washington, and the savings there would be \$1½ million per year.

In other words, as I read it, if I am correct in what you are trying to tell us, if you are able to build the 1 building which you are now talking about that increased \$10 million would be paid off in 10 years?

Mr. DULLES. That is correct, and that is on our estimates which are pretty hard estimates.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Isn't that the picture of what you have been trying to give us?

Mr. DULLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAHON. Make sure all the facts appear in the record.

Mr. DULLES. We will make all these charts available and put them in the record, sir.

(Discussion held off the record.)

TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION

Mr. MAHON. Will this construction generally speaking be conventional?

Mr. HARRISON. If anything it will be less attractive from the exterior point of view than the ordinary building in Washington because it is built very much more cheaply.

Mr. MAHON. What will the outside wall be?

Mr. HARRISON. Brick and concrete at the moment.

Mr. MAHON. How many stories high will it be?

Mr. HARRISON. Five stories average. It varies a little bit where you have basement areas, making it six. It is 90 feet wide and varied distances of wings.

Mr. MAHON. What would be the longest wing you have there?

Mr. HARRISON. 400 feet, but you have——

Mr. MAHON. 400 feet?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir; but you have something much longer than that. The farthest point from one end to the other would be much longer than that. That would be nearly 1,200 feet.

Mr. MAHON. Nearly 1,200 feet from one end of the building to the other?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAHON. It is all joined together?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir. The separate departments are kept in the various ends of the complex.

LIGHTING

Mr. MAHON. What sort of lighting would you have?

Mr. HARRISON. Fluorescent lighting, sir. With air conditioning you have to have fluorescent lighting. It is much cooler than incandescent.

Mr. MAHON. Fluorescent lighting——

Mr. HARRISON. Heat loss is much less.

Mr. MAHON. Do people generally care for fluorescent lighting?

Mr. HARRISON. A lot of people do. I don't like it at all, personally.

Mr. MAHON. I don't, either.

Mr. HARRISON. It is just a personal thing. From the point of view of economy in like units, fluorescent lighting is much cheaper when you have air conditioning.

Mr. MAHON. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

BUILDING DESIGN

Mr. POORMAN. We believe the architect has arrived at an economical approach. The building is sprawled over considerable territory but, as the Director outlined, there is a high degree of compartmentalization here which makes this a unique building. That has been recognized in the design. There are no abnormal features so far as details of construction are concerned. It is merely functional to meet their needs.

Fifty-six million dollars will bring it more along the lines of conventional building, as I said before.

Mr. DULLES. There will be several separate entrances to different wings of the building.

Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. MAHON. What is the largest room you have there?

Mr. HARRISON. This little unit here, gathering together people who have to be brought together, an auditorium here.

Mr. MAHON. How many seats will you have in the auditorium?

Mr. HARRISON. 500, I believe.

Mr. OSTERTAG. What purpose would this auditorium serve? Is it to be used for briefing?

Mr. DULLES. Briefing of trainees, very largely, sir. We do that a great deal. We will probably have it, also, so that it can be segregated and you can have some teaching courses there. We do a lot of training work.

Then there are various meetings we have with various segments of the Agency.

We have large briefings for outside people, too. There will be meetings of a whole group there.

Mr. MAHON. Any further questions, gentlemen?

Mr. HARRISON. I would like to add one thing here, and that is this: I think very often anybody working in the Government is being criticized generally for not being economical. We have built many office buildings in this country. We have never built anything as economical as this as an office building for private enterprise.

I think that adds something to what the Government does do once in a while. We never built a building 90 feet wide. We build them 70 feet wide. We are building these 90 feet wide. In other words, we are building for the people of the Government more cheaply than we would for the United States Steel Corp.

Mr. MAHON. What is the distinction between 90 feet and 70 feet?

Mr. HARRISON. Simply that it is cheaper to build a building 90 feet wide. You have fewer concrete piers, bricks, and so forth.

Mr. POORMAN. Wall space is less, also.

ADEQUACY OF BUILDING

Mr. MAHON. As a citizen and taxpayer do you think this building is reasonably adequate?

Mr. HARRISON. I think this is a very fine building.

Mr. MAHON. And serviceable?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, sir. I could wish it would be a little more decorative but that is a personal feeling.

Mr. DULLES. We hope to have it slightly better on that opening in the entrance court there.

Mr. HARRISON. That is right. We have allowed for some development in the courtyard in front.

RETENTION OF HIGH LEVEL PERSONNEL

Mr. DULLES. To add one word in conclusion: The problem of retaining the high-level personnel which we need for the very difficult and delicate type of work we are doing is getting more and more

difficult. We are losing very good personnel to industry, and in some cases to the universities and colleges.

In planning our site and planning our building, we believe we are going to create on the whole better working conditions than any other Government building in Washington; the fact that we will have nearby adequate parking space of this type is quite unique.

The Pentagon has it largely but this will be even more convenient than the Pentagon, and we believe we will have in this particular rural area conditions of work, conditions surrounding work which will help us very appreciably in holding our employees because of the better conditions under which they will be able to work.

Mr. MAHON. You will be able to get better teamwork, and a better quality of work?

Mr. DULLES. I believe so. No doubt about the teamwork. Now we have our different sections separated by miles in many cases. The people who have to come up to see me have to come up sometimes a mile, spend a half hour to come see me and a half hour to go back.

Mr. MAHON. Thank you very much, gentlemen, and thank you again, Mr. Dulles.

LOCATION OF SITE FOR CIA BUILDING

WITNESS

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

We will now hear from our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, Representative Richard E. Lankford.

Mr. LANKFORD. It is my understanding that the Central Intelligence Agency has requested from this committee an additional large sum of money for the construction of a headquarters building to be built at Langley, Va. I am opposed to this appropriation and feel that the construction of the proposed building at Langley, Va., would be a waste of money. There are other sites which would be more than adequate for the purposes of the Central Intelligence Agency which would cost considerably less money.

I direct your particular attention to a tract in Prince George's County, Md., known as the Good Luck Road tract. This tract has met all the criteria laid down by the Central Intelligence Agency and would not need any additional construction of roads to meet the particular criteria for accessibility. Furthermore, the land is owned by the United States Government and it has been determined that the site is immediately available.

In addition to this, the particular site mentioned is one of which there is no controversy by the residents of near-by communities or the county governmental body.

Again, may I stress that it seems to me to be a wasteful use of the taxpayer's money to go to the additional expense of erecting the CIA headquarters in Langley, Va., when there are other sites available, equally as suitable, which would be just as compatible with the use contemplated.

OPPOSITION TO CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDING AT LANGLEY, VA.

WITNESS

ROGER FISHER, McLEAN, VA

Mr. MAHON. We will proceed, gentlemen, and hear from Mr. Roger Fisher.

Mr. FISHER. My name is Roger Fisher. I am a resident of the McLean area in Virginia. I live myself a few miles from the Langley site.

I am here today in behalf of some 700 residents and property owners of that area who have signed a petition opposing the location of the CIA at Langley.

SIGNERS OF PETITION

Mr. MAHON. I wish you would tell me if on your list of 700 people you count the head of the household, such as the husband, or do you include also the wife, and the children?

Mr. FISHER. No children. We count a husband, a wife, and a property owner, even though not resident in those three precincts.

Mr. MAHON. Suppose there are some grown children who live with the family?

Mr. FISHER. Eighteen years of age. We told our workers to get no signatures of anyone less than 18 years old.

Mr. MAHON. If people are living with the family 18 years of age or over, whether they are with the family or not, they were counted?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, sir. This map shows the location of the people who signed our petition. The X indicates the proposed CIA site. The group of pins are clustered around in the McLean-Langley area in opposition, that is, showing the residents opposed to this.

Mr. MAHON. Do you have copies of the petition?

Mr. FISHER. I will give you the original petition.

WORDING OF PETITION

Mr. MAHON. I would like to know the wording of the petition.

Mr. FISHER. The wording is "Opposed to construction of any large office building on the Government tract."

Mr. MAHON. (Reading the petition):

To whom it may concern: The undersigned residents and property owners of the Langley, McLean, and Forestville precincts of Fairfax County urge:

1. That the present general character of the area be maintained through adoption of residential zoning of 1 acre or more in substantially those areas for which such zoning is proposed in the McHugh master plan;
2. That to the same end the Government tract at Langley be preserved for use as a wilderness park, and that no large building of any Government agency be located there.

That is the petition you are talking about?

Mr. FISHER. That is right. We wish to show we are for something as well as against something.

We are for having this land now in Government hands kept as a park.

Mr. MAHON. You are for the status quo, generally speaking?

Mr. FISHER. Generally speaking, yes. Congress already has authorized the National Capital Planning Commission to occupy unused

Government land along the Potomac as part of the George Washington Memorial Parkway scheme. The planning commission has existing authority to occupy this entire Government tract as part of a park if CIA does not locate there.

INTEREST OF MR. FISHER

Mr. MAHON. Will you show us on the map where you live, Mr. Fisher?

Mr. FISHER. At this point, sir.

Mr. MAHON. You own your home?

Mr. FISHER. I own the house and about 15 acres at that site.

Mr. MAHON. What is your special interest in this? People don't go to all this trouble unless they have a very special interest.

Mr. FISHER. My special interest is in preservation of the area there. I have worked with other members of the citizens association there, and by a process of being drafted more or less I have gotten into this thing.

Mr. MAHON. What is your post office?

Mr. FISHER. McLean, which serves both areas. This post office serves everybody in this area.

Mr. MAHON. Do you own any other property than the 15 acres you have referred to in the area?

Mr. FISHER. No, sir.

Mr. MAHON. You have no selfish or financial interest other than the interest of preserving the area somewhat as it is.

Mr. FISHER. That is correct.

Mr. MAHON. I assume if you bring several thousand people near your area and give them jobs many of them will build homes in that general area, at least some of them. Many of them will shop in that general area, and it will to some extent add to the so-called prosperity and activity there.

CONFLICTING VIEWS OF AREA RESIDENTS

Mr. FISHER. That is the view of our chamber of commerce in Fairfax County.

Mr. MAHON. The chamber of commerce therefore favors this new development?

Mr. FISHER. They are all for it. The more development the better. That is where we differ. We don't want——

Mr. MAHON. Is that the view of your Congressman?

Mr. FISHER. Congressman Broyhill, who represents this area, stated last summer that as between the two sites which then were being considered in Virginia, this one and the one on the Shirley Highway, he would prefer the Shirley Highway site because of the strong local opposition at Langley.

He was later told, at least he told his constituents he was told, by top CIA officials, that if CIA did not locate at Langley they would not locate anywhere in Virginia.

His position since then has been to support the location of the CIA at Langley, which is in Virginia.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Broyhill is one of our colleagues. We would not want any incorrect position presented with respect to his feelings.

Mr. Crosby, will you see that he sees the transcript, please?

In other words, the majority of the people in the county and that area apparently are for the project, but there are about 700 of you who are against it?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think this question should be decided by a Gallup poll. I think we would do as well by a Gallup poll as the other side.

Mr. MAHON. I thought Mr. Broyhill's study showed that of the people in that area—

Mr. FISHER. He sent out a questionnaire which did show a majority of those answering as approving the project.

Mr. MAHON. About 3 to 1 in your area, was it not?

Mr. FISHER. The statement in the questionnaire which went out was to the effect it would not locate anywhere in Virginia unless it located at Langley. That had a good deal of effect.

Mr. MAHON. Why would that have much effect in the Langley area? If they didn't want it they would say "Good, let us get rid of this thing."

Mr. FISHER. The commercial interests who thought they would not have it anywhere in Virginia if they didn't have it here went to work. Our local editor, who himself is chairman of the McLean-Langley Citizens for CIA, urged everyone to return the post cards. They previously had used paid solicitors on a door-to-door basis to get names in favor of locating CIA there. They paid them \$1 an hour plus 5 cents a name to recruit names supporting this site.

I do not know that they used paid solicitors in answer to the questionnaire, but there was a good deal of effort there.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Do you know it to be a fact?

Mr. FISHER. I know they used paid solicitors on the petition they presented to the Planning Commission. Also, the chairman of the committee, Mr. Richard M. Smith, editor of the local paper, has an interest in which he gets 5 percent of the gross water revenue of all new customers in the McLean area for the next 16 years, and in that his position of interest in the area is somewhat different from mine.

I am sure he does not know to what extent this financial interest affects his view. He does have a remarkably important commercial interest in bringing in new people into the area.

Colonel White has been active with his friends in the county to keep them informed.

One reason I got into this in the beginning is that I was called up by Mr. Smith the day after I first talked to Colonel White and asked to lay off and not do anything, and couldn't he talk to me before I did anything rash. That got me more interested, and I am afraid, was partly responsible for my getting involved in it.

I would like if I might to cover briefly some of the important points that may not have been brought out in the affirmative testimony you have had.

I am here not because I think these 700 residents should stop a project of interest to the Government. I am here because I believe that if you hear both sides of the story you will have a better basis for judging the merits of this project. If you understand the facts,

I think you will agree that if any agency other than CIA came to you to ask for an extra \$8 million to locate in an area which had inadequate roads, on potential park land, on land tending to aggravate pollution problems—because they would like the working conditions there and because they would like a view of the river—you would laugh them out and chastise them for coming in.

I believe this Agency, taking advantage of its unique position in Government, has come in with a proposal that is shockingly contrary to sound planning.

In October 1954 CIA requested an exception from the dispersal regulations to permit them to locate in the District. They received an exception in December of 1954, I understand, and at that time that exception was granted with the understanding that they would stay outside the District. They were to stay as far from the District as they could but they did not have to go the full 10 miles beyond the periphery of the developed area.

APPROVAL OF PLANNING GROUPS

In March of 1955 it was announced that CIA was considering the Langley site. There was a leak to that effect.

During the first week of April of last year the agency wrote the Planning Commission and stated that this site was not under further consideration and need not be given further consideration.

Discussions with the planning staff indicated that it met none of the criteria. It met so few of the criteria, perhaps I should say that it should not be given any further consideration.

It was the only site singled out at that time to which no further consideration need be given.

In July of 1955—

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Who made that statement?

Mr. FISHER. A letter from the agency to the Planning Commission saying that the site was not under further study and need not be given further consideration.

Is that substantially correct, Colonel White?

Mr. WHITE. No; it is not correct. I have a copy of the letter with me. Perhaps we can read the exact statement.

The problem was this, Mr. Chairman:

The George Washington Memorial Parkway, which Mr. Fisher is commenting on, will cost \$8½ million to extend from its present terminus at Spout Run to the Langley site.

This authorization has been on the statute books since 1930. This is an expenditure which the Federal Government will eventually undertake without regard to the location of the CIA Building.

We had hoped to get our site through the National Capital Planning Commission before we came in for our legislation authorizing this building last year.

We waited until about the 1st of April, and feeling that if we were going to get any consideration by the Congress during that session we must put in our legislation, we put it in without asking for the provision for the George Washington Memorial Parkway because of the many uncertainties which did surround this site at that time.

I will read the paragraph from my April 4 letter which deals with this matter.

As you know, after consultation with the Public Buildings Service, we had considered that the site at the Public Roads Research Center in Langley, Va., would be a desirable location and requested your concurrence in principle prior to undertaking the resolution of various other problems in connection with the use of this site. Among others, a major problem was the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. Several of these problems have not been solved, and we now feel that we must proceed with our request for congressional approval of this project without further delay despite the fact that a site has not been definitely selected.

Accordingly, we plan to include language in proposed legislation to be submitted to the Congress within the next few days which, if enacted, will authorize construction of a CIA headquarters building. Since we do not have a definite site to propose, and in view of the many problems developing in connection with the use of the Langley property, we have decided to omit from the proposed legislation any language which would provide for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway without which we do not believe use of the Langley property would be feasible.

We never completely abandoned the Langley property but it was so uncertain at this time that we did not feel we should provide for the extension of the parkway in our legislation.

When it became apparent that the water, sewage, and other problems could be solved, our request for legislation was amended. And of course our authorization (Public Law 161) makes specific provision for the parkway if the Langley site is used.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The point about that was that the Langley site could not be used and it would not be used unless this highway or parkway would develop?

Mr. WHITE. Exactly correct, sir.

Mr. RILEY. To whom was it written?

Mr. WHITE. The Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission. It is dated April 4, 1955.

Mr. FISHER. The letter received by the Commission stating that CIA was not going to request authorization which would include the possibility of locating at Langley meant that the Langley site was the one site to be excluded from consideration by the Planning Commission since every other site which did not have the requirement for this extra \$8½ million for the parkway would presumably be included in the general authorization language.

In June 1955, CIA, contrary to that letter, requested language which would include the authorization to construct the parkway out to the site, and in July this was made public.

Hearings were held in the Senate. The Senate committee stated that "further careful study and investigation should be made before the site is fully determined" and pointed to the local objection and difficult traffic problem involved at Langley. As you know last year Congress appropriated \$5½ million to start the study and preparation of plans, of which \$2½ million, I believe, could have been used to start work on the parkway.

In July the Planning Commission asked the CIA if they had any problems, any further views on the site selection which they wanted to discuss with the Planning Commission.

In a letter of August 1 the Agency indicated they were not yet ready with any proposals to bring to the Planning Commission.

The agency retained New York consultants, professional planners, and in November requested the Planning Commission to approve the Langley site, and submitted the report of their professional planners.

In December the Regional Planning Council—there are two planning bodies which you have to keep in mind on these problems. One is the National Capital Regional Planning Council and the other, the National Capital Planning Commission.

For the location of buildings in the environs of Washington, both must be consulted; neither has authority to stop or control. They merely can give advice and recommendations.

The Regional Planning Council, by divided vote, 6 to 4, I believe, approved the location at Langley and unanimously at the same meeting requested that if the CIA chose the Langley site they should ask for authorization and funds to include additional road facilities totaling some \$30 million or more, additional roads to service the site.

(The resolution of the Council was as follows:)

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGIONAL PLANNING COUNSEL
AT ITS MEETING ON DECEMBER 5, 1955

Resolved, That the Council request that the Central Intelligence Agency, in conjunction with its request for appropriations, ask for authorization and appropriations for the improvements not yet committed which are related to this development as described in the report of its Director:

Chain Bridge widening along with Canal Road and Weaver Place improvement; Virginia Route 123—parkway to Chain Bridge; Glebe Road—Lee Highway to Chain Bridge; Parkway to Cabin John Bridge, including Cabin John Bridge; George Washington Memorial Parkway—Maryland side; outer belt—route 7 in Virginia to U. S. 240 in Maryland.

This was the unanimous resolution of the Regional Planning Council.

When I discussed this with people at the Agency they stated it was not mandatory, that this was merely a recommendation.

The Regional Planning Council has no mandatory power. Everything they do is only in an advisory capacity.

A 6-4 vote approved Langley. CIA ignored the unanimous vote that additional roads were required to serve the site.

A few days later it came before the National Capital Planning Commission. There the Langley site was disapproved by a vote of 6-4. A vote was added after the meeting to make it 6-5 disapproving the site.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The National Capital Planning Commission?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. In December they disapproved the location at Langley. The public buildings representative, Mr. Poorman, abstained from voting, and the Army Corps of Engineers' representative, Mr. Zach voted in opposition to it. He previously had made extensive studies of the many road problems involved, as well as the threat to the pollution of District water supplies by installing a large installation above the water intake which would encourage development in that area.

CHANGE IN MEMBERSHIP OF PLANNING COMMISSION

These 2 Government employees serving on the Commission were replaced by 2 other individuals. CIA requested a reconsideration by the Planning Commission. At this next meeting when the reconsideration took place these two new individuals supported the site. Those were the only two votes that were changed. The National Capital Planning Commission was thus put on record as approving the site. No one changed his mind.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. A 6 to 5 vote?

Mr. FISHER. 7 to 5 vote. The first man had abstained, Mr. Poorman abstained the first time, and that vote was now on the other side. It was a 7 to 5 vote the other way.

The Planning Commission then prepared its report discussing the problems involved. That report has been submitted to the agency, and if it is not already included in your record I would suggest it be included.

(The report referred to is as follows:)

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION,
Washington 25, D. C., March 2, 1956.

Mr. ALLEN W. DULLES,
Director, Central Intelligence Agency,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. DULLES. As indicated in my letter of February 6 and pursuant to your request, the National Capital Planning Commission reviewed further your proposal to establish a new headquarters for the Central Intelligence Agency at Langley, Va., and approved this proposal.

In its new findings the Commission has accorded overriding importance to the emphasis placed upon your statements contained in your letter of January 23, 1956, that you are not free to select a location within the District and that by virtue of emergency measures already taken it is important for you to locate on the west side of the Potomac River and that you desire that the location be at Langley.

The Commission has approved the enclosed final report prepared by a committee of the Commission. The committee has set forth in this report the obstacles which it feels must be overcome by the Federal and local governments to solve problems connected with this site.

Sincerely yours,

HARLAND BARTHOLOMEW, *Chairman.*

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION,
March 2, 1956.

FINAL REPORT ON THE PROPOSAL TO LOCATE THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
HEADQUARTERS BUILDING AT LANGLEY, VA.

At the request of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Capital Planning Commission at its meeting on February 3, 1956, reconsidered the action taken at its December meeting on the proposal to establish a new headquarters for the Agency at Langley, Va., and voted to approve the location considered by the Agency to be the most suitable site for its purposes.

The undersigned committee was appointed by the chairman to draft and submit the final report on this proposal, as required by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952. Membership of the committee includes those who have been for and against the Langley site.

As the Commission had been very evenly divided in both its initial opposition and subsequent approval of the Langley location, the committee has chosen to present the differing points of view on the basic planning issues involved.

CONCERN OF COMMISSION AND COUNCIL IN DECISION

Under the Planning Act of 1952, the Planning Commission and Regional Planning Council have collaborative responsibility to prepare and maintain a comprehensive plan for the development of the National Capital and its environs. As the central planning agency for the Federal and District Governments, the Commission has the prime duty of reviewing Federal agency development programs in order to advise as to their consistency with the comprehensive plan.

It is now widely recognized that the most important single factor influencing the development and supporting the general economy of the Washington region has been the growth and spread of Federal establishments. Consequently, the Commission's 1950 comprehensive plan laid great emphasis on the size and location of Government agencies. In order to produce an orderly and uniform expansion of the region, new Federal establishments which could be appropriately located outside the central area were to be distributed on the periphery of ex-

isting development or beyond, at such locations as to encourage local development that would be harmonious with other requirements of the plan. Except in Bethesda and Suitland, where commitments had already been made, no single installation larger than 5,000 employees was recommended. Furthermore, new installations were located at least 5 miles from each other or from other large established agencies.

The comprehensive plan, while serving as a general guide and directive for decisions on Federal establishments, also sets forth a general philosophy on land use and population distribution throughout the area. These basic policies provide the foundation or reason for a regional thoroughfare plan and policies for the provision of community facilities, such as water supply and sewage disposal. The development of such plans is the joint and collaborative responsibility of the National Capital Planning Commission and the Regional Planning Council under the provisions of the 1952 Planning Act.

IMPACT ON THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Commission's proposals for the location of future Federal establishments in the environs of Washington did not contemplate a large Federal establishment in the Langley area. On the contrary, its plan for the location of Federal employees limited the number of those ultimately necessary to complete the Public Roads Research Laboratory development, then estimated in round figures not to exceed 1,000. The principal reasons for this were that the location lay within an area traditionally developed and developing with small estates and single-family homes of low density, which it was generally agreed as desirable to encourage and protect. Furthermore, there was already located or committed in the northwest sector outside of downtown Washington a disproportionately large distribution of Federal employment, tending in the long run to encourage an unbalanced and intensive growth in that direction.

To offset this tendency, the comprehensive plan proposed in the Virginia sector generally west and southwest of the center, 4 locations for Federal establishments of approximately 5,000 employees each. These would have the effect of stimulating intensive suburban growth of a satellite character in localities where there is already established a nucleus for an urban environment and to public facilities already projected or needed.

Whereas the location of 10,000 employees, more or less, at Langley does not accord with the 1950 plan, a majority of the Commission believe that a revision of the plan to accommodate CIA can be appropriately made. The minority does not agree to this revision and believes that a location in Virginia west or southwest of the center of Washington would promote growth of territory better adapted for intensive stimulation.

The position of the majority of the Commission is that there will be no adverse long-range effect of the CIA installation upon the established land use of the surrounding territory. They believe that in the immediate future employees will continue to live very much where they now live and that traffic to and from the installation can be handled over bridges, highways and parkways already planned though not necessarily programed.

However, there is general agreement by both the Commission and the regional council that improvements proposed in the Commission's report of December 16 will need to be programed at an earlier date to accommodate the traffic volumes generated by the installation.

The other point of view, represented by the minority, is that there will be a very profound effect upon the surrounding community with an installation of this size. The reasoning is that inevitably there will be created a demand for more intensive development of tributary territory than has heretofore been contemplated. The fact that only about one-eighth of the employees of CIA own their own homes lends support to the viewpoint of the minority that a marked change in land use for the Langley area is inevitable. The ensuing economic pressure upon land will make it increasingly difficult, if not impossible, for the Fairfax County authorities to maintain the same land use policies through zoning and subdivision control that have heretofore been envisioned as most appropriate and desirable for this area. This feeling is very strong among many property owners in the Langley area, is widely supported by professional planners and, perhaps most significantly, by the current waves of land speculation. In this connection, the minority draws attention to the change that has taken place in Arlington County since the construction of the Pentagon. In 1940 nearly

three-fourths of the dwelling units in the county were of the single-family type. Today, more than half of all units are apartments which have increased eightfold against only a doubling of the single-family type.

The Langley site meets the general requirement, set forth in the Commission's April resolution, that it be in close proximity to the outer circumferential. In this respect, the location conforms with the Commission's proposed regional thoroughfare plan, now generally accepted by the highway authorities. However, the priority for construction of major features of that plan will have to be advanced, as herein discussed, if it is proved that the traffic circulation facilities which the installation will require are inadequate.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The Regional Planning Council, in approving the Langley location last December, voted also to request that the Central Intelligence Agency request appropriations for certain improvements which it considered would be needed at the time the CIA headquarters is opened at Langley. The purpose of this action was, of course, to implement planning recommendations to which the local or State authorities were not financially committed.

It would seem that the first step toward putting into effect the Council's recommendation would be the development and agreement upon a program setting forth the specific community facilities required, and the estimates of cost and methods of financing. The latter is particularly important because of the different jurisdictions involved and the necessity for coordination in the programing of improvements. Following is a list and brief discussion of the important improvements which the studies of the Commission and the Council during the last year have revealed as being necessary to program definitely if the Langley site were chosen.

George Washington Memorial Parkway

The construction of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from Spout Run to Langley is universally accepted as having top priority. The Clarke-Rapuanio report also recommended that the parkway be extended to the Cabin John Bridge along the useful segments of the outer loop, in which recommendation this committee concurs.

While the legislation authorizing the use of the Langley location anticipated the construction of the parkway to Langley and provided for the allocation of necessary funds, the land acquisition program cannot be completed without additional contributions from Virginia to match Federal funds already available or to be made available for this purpose. Surveys and appraisals are required before precise costs can be ascertained. In all probability, several hundred thousand dollars will be needed from State and county authorities.

Other recommended projects

The regional planning council has recommended the following improvements be financed at Federal expense concurrent with construction by the Agency unless State or local financing is or can be secured:

(a) *Route 123.*—The widening to 4 lanes of Route 123 from Langley Corners to Chain Bridge (\$1,100,000). The State of Virginia has agreed to widen that portion of Route 123 from Langley Corners to the parkway (\$350,000).

(b) *Glebe Road.*—The widening of Glebe Road to 4 lanes from Lee Highway to Chain Bridge, estimated to cost \$1,300,000.

(c) *Chain Bridge widening.*—The District Highway Department has estimated the widening of this structure to a capacity of 4 lanes to cost \$1,350,000. The studies made by Clarke and Rapuanio and others indicate the need of additional capacity at an early date, especially if present CIA employees are to be encouraged to maintain their present residences. Otherwise, additional traffic will be brought into and out of the central district over central area bridges, especially Key Bridge.

(d) *Canal Road and Weaver Place.*—Required in connection with the widening of Chain Bridge will be improvements to approach roads on the District side, estimated at a cost of \$900,000.

(e) *Cabin John Bridge and segment of outer circumferential.*—While the Cabin John Bridge and the adjoining segments of the outer circumferential have been endorsed by the Highway Departments of Maryland and Virginia and the Bureau of Public Roads, no program for their financing and construction has been agreed upon. Without this facility, transportation to and from the Langley site will

be inadequate, causing serious congestion on existing highways. If the CIA desires to locate at Langley, based in part upon the proximity to the outer loop, the Agency should take the initiative in advancing the priority of this important improvement by endorsing Federal aid to this end.

(f) *Water supply and sewage disposal problems.*—So far as the Agency is concerned, it would seem to have solved its own immediate water and sewage problems through commitments already made by Federal and local authorities. Left unsolved, however, are services to any areas that may develop ahead of scheduled improvements due to the CIA installation.

(g) *Reservations for park and recreational needs.*—Regardless of any stimulus to local development from CIA, it has been estimated that, based on present standards and ultimate development of this section of Fairfax County at low density, at least four times the present park and recreational area will be required to meet future needs. Should the growth of the area be accelerated, as some anticipate, a program for financing advance acquisition of suitable open lands according to the plan should be initiated by the county authorities.

RECOMMENDED PLANNING CONTROLS

All those who have favored the Langley site have expressed great confidence in the ability of the county authorities, in cooperation with the interested agencies of the Federal Government, to control the character and extent of development which may either be required or which will take place as the result of the CIA installation. A clear understanding of mutual responsibilities should be formally established. To this end, it is suggested that the Central Intelligence Agency enter into a form of agreement or memorandum of understanding as to the policies of mutual concern that will be followed and financial responsibilities undertaken.

More than a year ago consultants for the Fairfax County Planning Commission completed a comprehensive plan for the county, including a land-use plan, setting up standards generally designed to maintain the single-family, low-density, open type of development for the Langley site.

CHECKLIST OF REFERENCE DATA RELATING TO CIA HEADQUARTERS LOCATION

National Capital Planning Commission report :

Resolution dated April 8, 1955 (general criteria).
Committee report April 7, 1955.
Joint Commission-Council report on alternate sites.
Committee report, December 16, 1955.

National Capital Regional Planning Council :

Staff summary report, March 11, 1955.
Staff report, March 31, 1955.
Committee report, April 7, 1955.
Staff report and recommendation, December 5, 1955.
Member statements approving Langley.

Fairfax County : Resolutions inviting CIA to county.

Central Intelligence Agency : Report of Clarke & Rapuano, October 25, 1955.

Other consultant reports :

Consultant—Draper report.
Consultant—Upham report.

Miscellaneous reports, documents, and letters :

Committee of 100.
Virginia Department of Highways.
Alexandria Chamber of Commerce.
Fairfax Chamber of Commerce.
Federal City Council.
Washington Board of Trade.
Citizens organizations.
Letters from many interested citizens.

The report includes a covering letter from Mr. Bartholomew dated March 2, 1956, pointing out the many planning problems involved in locating at Langley and includes the recommendations of the com-

mittee which prepared the report, which was endorsed by the Commission, that substantial additional Federal funds were required for immediate road improvements beyond those visualized.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Does it specify how much?

ADDITIONAL ROADS SYSTEMS REQUIRED

Mr. FISHER. It indicates the roads systems that are required. The Regional Planning Council has since then established a committee to prepare cost estimates on these. There was some publicity about their meeting earlier this month. The final report of the Regional Planning Council committee, which totals some \$30 million worth of additional roads, not all of which are to be borne by the Federal Government—

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is that over and above the eight?

Mr. FISHER. The \$30 million figure includes the \$8½ million, and some of those they recommend be borne by State authorities.

The minimum roads which the Commission and the Council apparently unanimously believed were required are those shown on this map in solid red and dashed red lines.

This is the parkway and this is the proposed site.

Chain Bridge, here, must be widened to four lanes. CIA's own consultants recommend six lanes.

We have here the widening of Arizona Avenue, Canal Road, and the widening of 123 up to the site. None of these have been committed or promised by any authority except that Virginia has indicated that it will widen this distance of 1.3 miles on Route 123.

This section of the parkway from the site to the Cabin John Bridge is needed but is not included in CIA's request.

Here we have the Cabin John Bridge and the outer belt highway from Route 240 in Maryland at least as far as Route 7 in Virginia. These are all included in the recommendation of the Planning Commission and the Planning Council as being necessary for completion when the building is completed.

This bypass around Langley and McLean was not included in their recommendations, but both the State and the county are so concerned over the congestion through Langley and McLean that they have plans and are surveying this right-of-way for immediate use. Where they will get the money they do not know. If they get a road plan they will come back to see where they can get help to construct that road.

Mr. RILEY. Without objection a copy of the report will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The information is as follows:)

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

Report of the committee on community facilities needed in the vicinity of Langley, Va., in relation to the new headquarters building for the CIA

The Regional Council directed this committee to carefully analyze all of the community facilities that have been proposed to service the headquarters building for the Central Intelligence Agency in the vicinity of Langley, Va., and submit requirements with estimated cost as well as the jurisdiction which should be responsible for the programing. This report will have the purpose of alerting the responsible Federal, State, and local governmental agencies as to their part in programing this project on a coordinated basis.

The committee, after reviewing the problem, was of the opinion that the report should be in three parts, the first having to do with highway and bridge needs which are the primary facilities to be programmed, and represent a large portion of the costs. The second part has to do with the need for a special program during the construction period, to be sure that present traffic needs can be served with minimum disruption. The third part will be to reiterate, in line with the stated desires of the county and Agency, those phases of the local planning process which must be accomplished to insure the orderly development of the Langley area according to plan.

I. HIGHWAYS AND BRIDGES

The following projects are recommended by the committee as needs that should be provided concurrent with construction of the headquarters building.

A map has been prepared (plate 1) to facilitate your study of this report. The recommended projects are shown on the map with the corresponding numbers.

(1) Route 123 (Virginia) from Langley Corner (Route 193) to the George Washington Memorial Parkway. This highway is to be widened from the existing narrow, 2-lane road, to a 4-lane divided highway. This highway at the present time is the only route giving access to the Langley property and will in the future be an integral part of the approach network, both north and south, carrying commercial as well as passenger vehicles.

This project is estimated at \$350,000, and is committed by the Virginia Department of Highways to be constructed concurrently with the parkway.

(2) Route 123 (Virginia) from the parkway to Chain Bridge. This is a continuation of project (1) upgrading this facility from a 2-lane road to a 4-lane divided highway serving as the approach road from the Chain Bridge crossing to the site. The Regional Council in its action approving this report recommended that both projects (1) and (2) be considered as a single unit functionally in relation to the approach network. This project is estimated to cost \$750,000 and is presently uncommitted. It is recommended that this project be assumed along with (1) by the State of Virginia.

(3) Glebe Road (Route 120, Virginia) from Lee Highway to Chain Bridge. This is an important facility giving access to Route 123 and Chain Bridge from a heavily populated section of Northern Arlington County. This highway is presently a narrow, winding 2-lane road and is proposed to be widened to a 4-lane divided highway including acquisition of new rights-of-way to provide for better alignment. This project is estimated to cost \$2,200,000 and is not committed at this time. The Committee recommends that the State of Virginia be responsible for the programming of this project.

(4) Chain Bridge widened to 4-lanes. This project is essential to provide required capacity to serve the improved approach roads. This project is estimated to cost \$1,350,000 and is not presently committed.

(5) Canal Road and Weaver Place improvements (District of Columbia). This improvement is essential to provide additional capacity to serve the Chain Bridge, Glebe Road and Route 123 improvements. This project is estimated to cost \$900,000 and is not committed.

(6) George Washington Memorial Parkway from Spout Run to the Langley site (Virginia). This improvement completes the parkway as an access road continuously from the central area bridges to the site. This project is estimated to cost \$8,500,000. The Congress has committed construction funds for this project concurrent with the approval of the Langley site for the headquarters building. The State of Virginia and Fairfax County are responsible for one-half (25 percent from each) of the cost of land acquisition. The National Capital Planning Commission is responsible for the remaining one-half of the cost of land acquisition in behalf of the Federal Government. The acquisition funds are currently available through the Federal, State, and local agencies. Some adjustment may be required in line with current land costs.

(7) George Washington Memorial Parkway from the Langley site north to the Cabin John Bridge and circumferential highway (Virginia). This project gives high standard access north and east from Virginia and Maryland populated areas. The cost of this project is estimated at \$2,250,000 and is not committed at this time. The Committee recommends that the Federal Government be responsible for the construction and one-half of the cost of land acquisition (National Capital Planning Commission) with the State of Virginia and Fairfax County jointly being responsible for the remaining one-half of the cost

for land acquisition. Current status of land-acquisition funds indicate that preliminary action is being taken to provide for the Federal one-half of the land-acquisition moneys.

(8) Cabin John Bridge and approaches. This facility is essential in the approach network from the north relating to the circumferential in Virginia and Maryland and the parkway south. This project is estimated to cost \$7,100,000 and is uncommitted at this time. The Committee recommends that the appropriate Federal agency be responsible, in particular as a part of the Interstate Highway System on the proposed 90-10 matching formula now before the Congress. The States would be responsible for their share.

(9) Circumferential highway from Route 7 to Cabin John Bridge (Virginia). This facility would provide distribution on the Virginia side providing a more balanced flow of traffic to the access points such as the Langley and central areas. This project is estimated at \$4,100,000 and is uncommitted at this time. The Committee recommends that it be constructed as a part of the Interstate Highway System dependent for programing in the highway legislation now before Congress. On this basis it would be eligible for construction under the 90-10 financing formula with the State paying its share. The Committee also suggests that this project be set up as phase I with the section of the circumferential from Jones Point to Shirley Highway as phase II. That section from Route 7 to Route U. S. 50 as phase III, and from U. S. 50 to Shirley Highway as phase IV. No cost estimates were available for phases II, III, and IV.

(10) Circumferential highway from Cabin John Bridge to U. S. 240 (Maryland). This improvement would serve as a distributor on the Maryland side serving the northwest section with access to the Langley site as well as the central area. This improvement is estimated to cost \$4,331,000 and is presently committed in the early portion of the Maryland 12-year program. The Committee recommends that it be constructed as a part of the Interstate Highway System eligible for 90-10 financing under the legislation now before the Congress. The State would be responsible for its share. The Committee also recommends that the balance of the circumferential be constructed in accordance with the Interstate Highway program because of its importance as a distributor route on the Maryland side.

The Committee also recommends that the appropriate State and county authorities study traffic requirements related to certain other facilities in Virginia such as Route 123, Route 193, Route 309, Route 693, Ball's Hill Road, Mackneal Road, Great Falls Road and any others in order that needed improvements be fitted into their program.

The Committee hesitated at this time to assign priorities to all the needed highway and bridge facilities since there are a number that must be constructed concurrently with the headquarters building. However, after discussion of the overall needs, the Committee agreed that the Cabin John Bridge should be given highest priority in the uncommitted improvements.

II. SPECIAL PROGRAM DURING CONSTRUCTION PERIOD

The Committee is of the opinion that it is important for the Agency to work out with the appropriate Federal, and State, and local agencies a coordinated plan to handle the construction program to allow minimum disruption of existing daily traffic in the vicinity of Langley. It is conceivable that the widening of Route 123, the construction of the parkway and the construction of the building will be going on simultaneously. Unless this is programed in advance the 1,600 plus automobiles per lane in the morning and evening peaks now using Route 123, Glebe Road, and Chain Bridge will be seriously disrupted. Also the construction traffic generated with slow-moving trucks hauling materials will add to this problem.

III. ADDITIONAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Since the agency and the county both emphasized during the consideration of this matter the importance of maintaining the present character of this area as nearly as possible, the committee respectfully emphasizes the prime importance of adopting a comprehensive plan as a key element to the programing of this project. This action will strengthen the zoning and subdivision controls necessary in implementing the plan.

This step will establish the basis for determining present and future requirement for the following important community facilities:

(a) *Water supply.*—The committee in reviewing the present source of supply finds that there should be an adequate supply of water through the Falls Church system by the time the building is ready for occupancy. At the present time, Falls Church is purchasing water, by contract, from Arlington County which is serviced by the line across Chain Bridge. This contract stipulates that should Arlington County find it necessary to terminate the agreement they must give Falls Church sufficient time to supplement their source of supply. The city of Falls Church by agreement with the Corps of Engineers dated December 1, 1954, has deposited funds for the construction of a 36-inch main in the new Little Falls Dam now being constructed. The city of Falls Church still has to provide funds for a connection to the Dalecarlia plant on the District of Columbia side and a line from the dam to their system on the Virginia side. The Falls Church Water Department stated in October 1955, by letter, that funds required to complete this system are in their capital budget with construction presently scheduled to be started in fiscal 1958 and completed by 1960. However the letter states that should the system be required sooner their plans are elastic enough to permit completion at an earlier date.

(b) *Sewage treatment.*—The committee agreed that the present commitments by the county should provide adequate facilities for the headquarters building. These commitments are in the form of a letter to the agency stating that the county will provide a line immediately available to the property with no cost to be borne by the Federal Government. The committee suggests that care be exercised in order to meet the standards established by the Corps of Engineers and the Interstate Commission of the Potomac River Basin relating to river pollution.

(c) *Park and recreation needs.*—The committee emphasizes the importance of planning and acquiring the needed sites prior to the development of the area, while land values are reasonable.

(d) *School site.*—Here again the committee suggests early acquisition of sites according to the plan before the development takes place.

DONALD E. GINGERY, *Chairman.*
JOHN W. BROOKFIELD.
Brig. Gen. THOMAS A. LANE.
FREDERICK A. GUTHEIM.
ROY BRAGG.

May 29, 1956.

Mr. FISHER. The covering letter to the report of the National Capital Planning Commission points out:

In its new findings the Commission has accorded overriding importance to the emphasis placed upon your statements contained in your letter of January 23, 1956, that you [Mr. Dulles] are not free to select a location within the District and that by virtue of emergency measures already taken it is important for you to locate on the west side of the Potomac River and that you desire that the location be at Langley.

There are three points to which overriding importance was given by the Commission, even after this double switch and the reverse vote. I would like to touch on each one of those briefly.

FREEDOM TO SELECT SITE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The first is his statement that he was not free to select a location within the District. This is based on the understanding in the fall of 1954, at the time CIA was granted an exception to the dispersal regulations. Those regulations were modified in January of this year and the head of each agency is now the one who is to make the decision as to the location of his site.

Mr. MAHON. Do you take a position that probably it should be located in the District?

Mr. FISHER. I take the position that the District would be a great deal better, from every point of view, than the Langley site.

Mr. MAHON. Why do you not amplify your remarks for the record on that point?

Mr. FISHER. I appreciate the opportunity of doing so.

(The following was submitted by Mr. Fisher in amplification:)

The advantages of locating the CIA within the District have been apparent to all. Last year, when testifying about the proposed building before the Senate Appropriations Committee Mr. Allen Dulles himself said: "I would prefer personally to build it in Washington."

The District Commissioners have urged CIA to stay in Washington, as have all of the Washington newspapers. Civic organizations as well have supported selection of a site within the District.

Three reasons have been advanced for not locating in the District:

- (1) Traffic congestion.
- (2) Dispersal against enemy attack.
- (3) Ready access to an evacuated location in the event of attack.

There is no merit in any one of them.

1. *Traffic congestion.*—Mr. Dulles before the Senate committee last year said that there was a "feeling" in the executive branch that CIA should not be located where it "would further aggravate the traffic problems of the District." Apparently it was assumed without study that to locate in the District would do so. The facts are exactly contrary.

To stay in the District would cause no increased congestion since CIA is now in the District. To locate at Langley would require many employees who otherwise could use public transportation to drive cars through the District.

The inner-loop highway and Constitution Avenue Bridge will result in CIA personnel causing less congestion in the District than they do now.

That this is the correct factual situation is confirmed in Engineer-Commissioner Thomas Lane's letter of December 23, 1955, the full text of which is as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICES,
Washington, D. C., December 23, 1955.

Mr. ROGER FISHER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FISHER: I am writing in reply to your letter of November 29, 1955, inquiring whether the location of the Central Intelligence Agency would aggravate traffic congestion here whereas the location at Langley would relieve congestion in the District.

The effects of such a facility on traffic will depend upon the specific location selected; therefore, only general answers can be given to your inquiry.

As you know, the present facilities of CIA are located in several areas of Washington, D. C., with the central office at 24th and E Streets NW. The Washington locations afford ready access from all the suburban areas, as is demonstrated by the fact that employees of the Agency live in all these areas. The programmed early construction of the new Constitution Avenue Bridge and of the south leg of the Inner Loop Freeway will insure the continued ready access from suburban areas in the years ahead. The retention of CIA in the District of Columbia would not create any general traffic conditions which have not already been anticipated in our planning, although local effects would, of course, vary with the particular site used.

The move of the Central Intelligence Agency to Langley would have its principal effect upon the District of Columbia in the changed demands upon bridges and connecting roads. It would move the desired crossing points of many Central Intelligence Agency employees from the lower river where bridges are available and adequate additions have been planned, to the upper river where no early expansion program is contemplated. As you know, the Central Intelligence Agency feels that the traffic routes used by its employees can be controlled to avoid excessive congestion at the Chain and Key Bridges.

It does not appear that any more specific predictions about the effects of the Central Intelligence Agency location are practicable at this time.

Sincerely yours,

T. A. LANE,
Brigadier General, United States Army,
Engineer Commissioner.

In short to keep CIA in the District would eventually reduce rather than increase traffic congestion.

2. *Dispersal against enemy attack.*—The original and basic reason for locating CIA outside the District, decided upon in 1954, was to reduce the vulnerability of the Capital to an enemy attack. Since then CIA has been given full authority to weigh for itself the competing considerations. CIA has decided that day-to-day convenience of operation is more important than the safety factor of distance from the Capital. Langley has no dispersal advantage as it lies within the assumed area of total destruction.

3. *Ready access to an evacuated location in the event of attack.*—In January 1956, Mr. Dulles wrote to the National Capital Planning Commission:

"It is important to us to have the Agency headquarters situated on the west side of the Potomac in order to conform with emergency measures that already have been taken."

This apparently refers to the desirability of CIA personnel being able to reach the evacuation communication center established for CIA some distance from Washington on that side of the Potomac.

It is a fallacious argument advanced for the first time more than 6 months after CIA decided they wanted to go to Langley. It assumes that it will be easier to evacuate on a winding country road from Langley than on the many multiple-lane highways leading from the Key, Memorial, and Constitution Avenue Bridges.

I would like to submit the following memorandum as a serious discussion of the security and dispersal factors.

MEMORANDUM : SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS AFFECTING TWO ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS OF CIA

The two alternatives considered are as follows:

The first is to locate the entire agency in one building or group of buildings at Langley, Va., about a mile and a half from the District line. The second alternative is to locate something more than half the agency within the District readily convenient to the other agencies served and some smaller portion in a different building at a truly dispersed location. It is understood that the agency would be glad to locate some portion of the agency at a site meeting all dispersal standards.

The two advantages of moving away from the center of an assumed target area are: (a) Lessened risk of damage to the structure and personnel by a bomb blast; and (b) increased ease of evacuation from the target area. The Langley site is on exposed high ground less than 2 miles from the District line. It is about the same distance from the zero milestone as the corners of the District itself. A circle with a 5-mile radius will easily include the Langley site, the Pentagon, the Capitol, and all of downtown Washington.

The lessened risk of damage in locating at Langley compared with locating within the District is slight. This is particularly true as the size of the installation would be large enough to justify special attention in any attack.

From the point of view of increased ease of evacuation the situation at Langley is not good: The evacuation from Langley would presumably be by Route 193 leading northwest to Route 7 and then on that two lane highway. Route 193 is too narrow to carry two parallel lines of cars at any but a slow speed. Further, the four-lane parkway would stop at Langley causing a major bottleneck at the very point where CIA personnel would be imposed on the evacuation route.

From a District site near where CIA is now located, evacuation would be across the new eight-lane Constitution Avenue Bridge and then by any one of several major highways. There would be a further distance to travel from the District but the better highway position would appear to compensate for that. In short, the Langley site would appear to have no advantage over the District from the point of view of ease of evacuation.

The suggested alternative of locating a major part of the agency within the District and a minor part in a secure spot at a safe distance from Washington would appear to have substantial advantages. Those functions requiring day-to-day contact with other agencies could be located within walking distance of the State Department and with optimum efficiency for all peacetime operations. Laboratories, long-range study projects and other functions not requiring such contact could be located well away from the District.

In the event of attack there would be fewer employees requiring evacuation from the Washington area. Regardless of damage to that area the agency would have available a substantial nucleus from which it could carry on its vital post-attack intelligence functions. The dispersal branch of the agency would be small enough so as not to constitute by itself a probable target.

There would undoubtedly be some inconvenience to the agency resulting from having a branch building at a dispersed location. This inconvenience in peacetime operations might be no greater than that which would exist were the entire agency located at Langley. From the point of view of being prepared against every attack and considering the security requirements of postattack operational capability, there can be no doubt but that to locate the agency at Langley would be worse than to locate the bulk of the agency within the District and a part of it at a truly dispersed site.

The desirability and advantages of a District site have been explored in detail by the Federal City Council, which has pointed out the severe economic loss to the community which would result if CIA were to locate elsewhere. I would like to submit for the record the recommendations of Mr. Francis G. Addison, chairman, and Mr. George Garrett, president of the Federal City Council.

Mr. Addison is a former president of the Washington Board of Trade, president of the Security Bank and an outstanding local civic leader. Mr. Garrett is a former United States Ambassador to Ireland and was appointed by President Eisenhower as his personal representative to clear up problems in Washington's urban redevelopment program.

FEDERAL CITY COUNCIL

To: Mr. Allen Dulles, Director, Central Intelligence Agency.
From: Mr. Francis G. Addison, chairman and Mr. George Garrett, president,
Federal City Council.
Subject: Report on site recommendations.

NEED FOR DISTRICT SITE

Studies undertaken by the Federal City Council indicate that a District site for the new headquarters of the Central Intelligence Agency is a *must* from every standpoint—economic, geographic, and engineering. No effort should be spared to secure a decision favorable to such a location.

At least two choice sites are available within the District. They are: (a) CIA's present location and its surrounding area; and (b) the area now occupied by the National Training School For Boys.

Our studies were based on CIA's special requirements concerning traveling time and distance, area and topography, accessibility and facilities, availability and cost. They show that a District site for CIA is imperative because it would:

- (1) Avert severe economic losses to our community, which would result if CIA were to locate elsewhere;
- (2) Minimize construction costs, and engineering and personnel problems of the agency itself.

The council studies indicate that many of the obstacles which originally prevented CIA from selecting a site within the District are no longer present.

Results of this study formed the basis of our letters to you and to Commissioner Samuel Spencer December 21, urging that every possible effort be exerted to find a District site. The importance of the goal was further agreed to at a meeting December 30 between our council's CIA site committee and the District Commissioners.

At a meeting of our executive committee January 9, it was decided that a brief report on the two best site possibilities which emerged from our study, be prepared and submitted to you for consideration at our January 18 conference on CIA sites.

Facts in the following report represent expert engineering advice. They have been carefully checked and doublechecked from the standpoint of traffic, water supply, sanitary sewers, and physical characteristics. Potentialities of both sites presented have been discussed with the District Commissioners' Office, National Capital Planning Commission, and National Capital Regional Planning Council.

PRESENT CIA SITE

The most desirable single site for CIA would be the agency's present location and its surrounding area.

This is the judgment of top technicians, who point out that in terms of traveling time, accessibility, traffic and existing facilities, this area is superior to most others.

The entire area includes 72 acres, and is bounded by the following streets: Virginia Avenue and New Hampshire Avenue on the north, Constitution Avenue on the south, Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway on the west and 23d Street on the east.

About one-fourth of the area is federally owned. Among buildings now located on it are those used by the Navy Department and CIA; the old Christian Heurich Brewing Co. (soon to close down); various temporary Federal buildings and parking spaces; and a roller skating rink, now being used for CIA office space.

The region is a major hub of Washington's radial system of streets and highways. This means it would be easily accessible to the estimated 50 percent of CIA employees now living the District, as well as to those who are non-District residents.

Employees from the Northwest and Maryland, for example, could use any of a number of possible downtown approaches, ranging from 13th Street to Canal Road. This would permit use of such central arteries as 13th and 16th Streets, and Connecticut and Wisconsin Avenues. Virginia workers could travel most of the way to their offices over such major highways as Jefferson Davis, Wilson, Lee, Columbia Turnpike, and Arlington Boulevard.

In addition to these existing roads, future improvements are now being planned (the inner loop and new bridge) which will boost the area's traffic adequacy.

Location at this site would apparently not require transit companies to develop any new services. The area is served by all leading transit lines in the District, Virginia, and Maryland.

Moreover, in terms of traveling time, the region is close to the White House and State Department, National Airport, and Union Station.

Because no new highways, facilities, or transit services would be required, the savings in cost over any other location would obviously be tremendous even if the construction cost itself were higher.

Any inadequacies in outside parking area which may exist in the area would be largely offset by the fact that fewer parking facilities will be needed due to the central location and excellent transit facilities.

The central location would also minimize losses to the agency of clerical employees—losses which, according to professional planners and CIA's own administrators would be of serious concern were a non-District site selected.

All of these advantages led the National Capital Planning Commission to adopt a resolution on April 8, 1955, that serious consideration be given to the area surrounding CIA's present site, as the location for its new headquarters. This resolution still stands.

Availability: NCPC state's CIA's requirements can be met.

NATIONAL TRAINING SCHOOL FOR BOYS

The other top choice for a CIA site within the District, according to the Federal City Council study, is the National Training School area. Although this lacks some of the traffic advantages of the Northwest site, it possesses other features which account for its high ratings.

One major asset of this area is provided by its topography, and surroundings. The site is bounded completely on the north by Fort Lincoln Cemetery, and partially on the south by the National Arboretum. Its western side is flanked by the Anacostia River and recreational area.

The area itself includes 201 acres, consisting of several high ridges and a central valley coming down from the cemetery side. A building of the dimensions needed by CIA could be constructed in this pocket, and be screened from the roads by tall ridges on the south.

These unique features make the Training School area an ideal choice from the security viewpoint.

Most authorities interviewed by FCC rate the site "above average" on traffic and accessibility. It is located on the rim of the city's radial street system, rather than at the hub, as is the Northwest region. However, it is directly on the Baltimore-Washington Highway, which ties into South Dakota Avenue, New York Avenue, and Bladensburg Road—all central approaches to the city.

CIA workers from Northwest Washington could get to their offices by using the following connecting link of streets: South Dakota Avenue, Riggs Road, Missouri

Avenue, and Military Road. When the intermediate loop is completed, it will provide an across-town thoroughfare which would make this site even more convenient to Northwest workers than CIA's present site.

The area is served by two District bus lines, and one trolley line. Mass transit downtown is provided on nearby Bladensburg Road.

As in the case of the Northwest area, little extension of water, sewer, gas and electrical facilities would be needed to service any new Federal Buildings constructed on the site.

In its master plan of 1950, the National Capital Planning Commission earmarked this area for installation of Federal offices. At that time, it was contemplated these offices would house only 5,000 employees. However, spokesmen say the area could probably accommodate a building housing 10,000 to 15,000 workers.

Availability: Immediate, since the area is federally owned, largely unoccupied, and the Government can dispose of it in any way desired.

OLD OBJECTIONS OVERCOME

It is clear that the potentialities of both these areas would make either a desirable site for CIA's new headquarters.

It is equally clear that previous objections to location of CIA within the District no longer exist.

These objections centered mainly around the fear of increased traffic, and the need, as then visualized, for dispersing key agencies in anticipation of possible enemy attack.

Subsequent studies have shown the traffic fears to be groundless. See December 23 letters of Brig. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, USA, Engineer Commissioner, which reads in part * * * "Retention of CIA in the District would not create any general traffic conditions which have not already been anticipated in our planning * * *"

It is also understood that under new dispersal policies announced by ODM January 11, there would be no official objections to CIA's locating within the District, if the agency selected such a site on its own initiative.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Dulles stated last year that he personally preferred to locate in the District but was precluded by the decision of the executive agency. He so testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee and I believe before this committee.

Mr. MAHON. I think you would agree that there is a lot of congestion in the District, and many, many important agencies here. There is certainly considerable merit to the idea of some degree of dispersal.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to call your attention to a letter from General Lane, District Commissioner, concerning the traffic congestion problem in the District. This is a letter of his of December 23, 1955, to me. I wrote him asking about this problem.

As you know, the present facilities of CIA are located in several areas of Washington, D. C., with the Central Office at 24th and E streets NW. The Washington locations afford ready access from all the suburban areas, as is demonstrated by the fact that employees of the Agency live in all these areas. The programmed early construction of the new Constitution Avenue Bridge and of the south leg of the Inner Loop Freeway will insure the continued ready access from suburban areas in the years ahead. The retention of CIA in the District of Columbia would not create any general traffic conditions which have not already been anticipated in our planning, although local effects would, of course, vary with the particular site used.

The move of the Central Intelligence Agency to Langley would have its principal effect upon the District of Columbia in the changed demands upon bridges and connecting roads. It would move the desired crossing points of many Central Intelligence Agency employees from the lower river where bridges are available and adequate additions have been planned, to the upper river where no early expansion program is contemplated.

To leave CIA in the District is not bringing a new installation into the District. At the present time other installations are being moved out. This would simply be keeping employees who now work in the District.

They are constructing the Inner Loop Highway and the Constitution Avenue Bridge, which would serve the District area they now work in. In the opinion of General Lane, this will make that site more readily accessible by far than the site in Virginia.

I was confused by the statements of the Agency that they were not free to locate in the District. I requested clarification and received from the White House the statement that the head of the Agency concerned was responsible for determining whether the nature of the activity for such a new facility which is to be constructed would permit the use of dispersal. It was indicated that he is responsible for balancing requirements of postattack operational capability against day-to-day efficiency, and that the requirement of getting an exception from the ODM was no longer in force; that administratively no one had told the CIA they could not locate in the District as of the first of this year.

The agency itself apparently recognized that, because they now turn and say that because of Congress they are not free to locate in the District.

In going to the Planning Commission the Agency stated that:

Our authorization and appropriation were obtained with the clear understanding that while we were exempted from dispersal we would at the same time definitely not locate in the District of Columbia, but rather on the fringe of the metropolitan area of Greater Washington.

So they recognize that the administrative restriction is not now applicable, but they say that congressional action is binding. Last year Congress was told they could not do anything about it because the Executive had decided they had to locate outside the District.

It seems to me that the Planning Commission's approval of the Langley site, considering it as advice to Congress as to where CIA should locate, was based on a complete misunderstanding. The approval was based on a categorical statement that CIA could not locate in the District. But for that, the implication is that the Planning Commission would not have approved the site.

I suggest that Congress should leave open the possibility of locating in the District and should not consider the Agency as required by congressional action to locate outside the District when, as a matter of fact, the last report written on the subject by Congress last year stated that further study should be given to the site and that the action was not meant to preclude or include any particular site.

IMPORTANCE OF SITE BEING LOCATED ON WEST BANK OF POTOMAC

The second consideration to which overriding importance was given by the Planning Commission was CIA's statement that security considerations required them to locate on the west bank of the Potomac. I have had a harder time tracing this one down. Apparently there is a desire to keep in contact with the communications center established out in the Blue Ridge for postattack conditions. If that is so, the Constitution Avenue Bridge, with 6 or 8 lanes access across to the

entire multiple group of highways, would be a better place to start from than a location at Langley.

If it is based on the assumption that the bridges would be knocked out and they will not be able to cross the bridges, I think it is a little out of date. If the bridges are knocked out, with an attack of that size there will not be very many people trying to get across them after they are knocked out.

I have talked with those who are both inside and outside of the Government, with those persons responsible for the dispersal program. It is the opinion of those to whom I have spoken that the Agency would be better prepared for its day-to-day efficiency if some 90 percent or so of it were located in the District, with ready access to the State Department and the Defense Department, and others. Those few functions which do not have to be in daily contact: the longer range research projects, the laboratories; perhaps 5 or 10 percent of the Agency, which would require a substantial building, nonetheless, could be constructed and located in a truly dispersed location, so that you would have a going nucleus in case of attack.

The location at Langley is far enough away so that you do not have the convenience of ready access for discussions. On the other hand, it is well within the total destruction area for the size bombs now being considered. It is born of the unhappy compromise in 1954 between Mr. Dulles' desire for a District site and the ODM desire for true dispersal.

NEED FOR BUILDING IN PARK-LIKE AREA

The third consideration mentioned in Dulles' letter to the Planning Commission, to which the Planning Commission gave overriding importance, was the statement that Mr. Dulles preferred to locate at Langley. He has indicated that he contemplates a fine building which would have very desirable working conditions.

Last year, when he was requesting appropriations, it was spoken of in terms of an economy structure, reinforced concrete, courtyard-type building, 7 floors. There was some language that it would be:

A building of utility.

No frills.

Down to earth.

A minimum-type building.

Not a show place.

A practical-type construction that leans toward utilitarian aspects.

These are quotes from Mr. Dulles and some from the committee members in discussing the matter at that time.

When he went before the Planning Commission he drew a somewhat different picture. I want to read to you a newspaper account of that:

Mr. Dulles told the National Capital Planning Commission that he would construct a group of dignified buildings similar to those on the campus at Princeton, each with its own grove of trees and parking space. He said he thought Federal employees deserved better working quarters than the present massive buildings, and that he hoped to set up a new pattern for them in his CIA headquarters.

I heard his discussion that day and the personal enthusiasm with which he visualized being able to have attractive grounds and parking areas that would compete with the uniforms of the military and with

the titles of the diplomatic service, so that he would be able to attract and keep a higher type Government servant for a longer period—if only he could have a campus-like atmosphere on the bluff at the site at Langley!

I think his enthusiasm has carried him away. We each have our biased point of view.

My impression is that those Government employees who take a job and keep it because of the view, because of the park or because of convenience are not those who are doing the most effective work for the Government.

I think that in trying to build the agency with props of bushes and trees he has made a mistake, and that Congress is the one to say: "Whoa; no superclass employees with parks and parking lots for each one."

SEWAGE PROBLEM IN LANGLEY AREA

The final consideration which I should like to call to your attention is, I think, perhaps the most serious of all from the planning point of view. It is the problem of the pollution of the Potomac River, and the misapplication of incentives by locating this large agency just above the water intake for the District supply. The new water intake will be located right down here [indicating] where the dam is now being constructed, about a half mile below the CIA site.

Eventually both aqueducts at Great Falls are to be abandoned and the entire District water supply will be picked up at this point [indicating].

This is the Fairfax County area line. Above that point, in a triangle coming back toward Tyson's Corner, that way [indicating], is an area which has no sewage facilities now and for which none are included in the county's plan for the period up to 1980. They have laid out the bond issues and so forth for the proposed sewage. No facilities are planned to serve this area.

The prior administration of the county committed itself to provide sewage facilities for the building. They have so far not obtained permission to put the effluent even in Pimmit Run, which is contrary to the overall program of reducing pollution in the Potomac River.

Mr. MAHON. Where would the effluent be put?

Mr. FISHER. From the building the effluent would be put in at Pimmit Run, just below Chain Bridge, and below the water intake.

A building of 8,000 to 10,000 people is larger in office space than any other Government building now existing in this country, except the Pentagon. That is what they are talking about building here.

This will, as you have suggested, induce people to come out and build. The chamber of commerce certainly thinks so. The building industry certainly thinks so. There will be a lot of new people moving in.

The area where people normally build, from installations, is a pie-shaped piece running out from the town. You can get the cheapest land with the shortest commuting distance to the buildings. This entire area [indicating] would be either without sewage facilities, or you would have a rash of small sewage-treatment plants putting effluent into the Potomac River.

There was a very tough fight last summer, when a small plant on Scott Run was proposed to be brought in here [indicating]. That was stopped after a whole series of hearings.

I am not sure we will withstand the pressure. Already it has been suggested in Fairfax County that the Federal Government ought to pay for the construction of a canal or open sewer on the Virginia side of the Potomac to catch all of the polluted streams that would be coming in and keep them from contaminating the water supply. This costly scheme would be so that we could go ahead with development, because of the agency coming out here, and the fact that there would be the need. This proposal, I take it, is not being taken too seriously, but does indicate the serious threat of pollution of the Potomac River, which would follow development of the area.

Efforts are being taken by all agencies involved to reduce the present pollution. The Federal Government now has the opportunity of selecting a location in the Washington area for the largest single population inducer it has on the agenda. Why it should pick a location above the water intake, right on the shore of the Potomac, and buy itself that many more pollution problems in the years to come, I do not understand.

REVISION OF PLANNED USE OF AREA

The master plan of the Capital for this area calls for parkland on the Potomac and low density development on both sides. To locate CIA at Langley is a step, and a major step, in the wrong direction, a step which we should not take lightly simply because the agency is tired of kicking around and wants to get on with a building. They could have been a year ahead if they had picked any site less controversial. They chose the single site which was opposed by every professional planner who was consulted in this area. The only people who have approved it that I know of are the New York consultants which CIA retained.

These are some of the comments which professional planning experts have made:

"The resultant population increase will necessitate complete revision of the land use and zoning concepts now recommended in existing and proposed plans for this area."—Paul C. Watt, Director, National Capital Regional Planning Council

"* * * it is my considered judgment that the particular site proposed for this installation lies in one of the sections of the northern Virginia least able to accommodate it in terms of existing or foreseeable access, utilities, and services, or its disruptive effect upon the present character and desirable future development of the area."—Max S. Wehrly, Director, Urban Land Institute; member, National Capital Regional Planning Council.

"The proposed CIA development on Government-owned land in the Langley area * * * cannot be accepted without disastrous effect on the present land use and complete disruption of community relationships."—Earl S. Draper, former vice president, American Society of Landscape Architects, American Planning and Civic Association; former president, American Institute of Planners; former director, regional planning for TVA.

ACCESS ROADS

They have chosen a site which has no access roads. Mr. Dulles himself the last time stated that the present road is "very inadequate" and

"could not carry any more traffic." Now he proposes to put 25 percent of CIA's own traffic onto the present road, because the parkway itself will not accommodate even the CIA traffic during rush hours. They propose to add 1,000 cars each way, or 2,000 cars a day, onto the existing roads on top of the present traffic, as well as using the parkway exclusively for themselves in the direction in which they are going during the peak hour.

Even CIA's own consultants, as far as I know the only professional planners to approve the Langley site, state:

Chain Bridge should be widened to provide six lanes with a suitable connection to the proposed new dual parkway along the abandoned Baltimore & Ohio Canal on the east side of the Potomac River in the State of Maryland. It is further recommended, for immediate improvement, that additional lanes be added on Canal Road at least from Weaver Place to Chain Bridge and that Weaver Place be improved at least from Canal Road to MacArthur Boulevard.

Has CIA told you that Congress is going to be asked to pay for all these works as part of the cost of locating CIA at Langley?

Mr. MAHON. What is your position, Mr. Fisher?

Mr. FISHER. I am a lawyer here in town, sir.

Mr. MAHON. How long have you lived out in the Langley area?

Mr. FISHER. I have been in the county about 5 years, or almost 6 years.

Mr. MAHON. You have apparently made a very exhaustive study of this problem. I want to say that you have made an excellent presentation to the committee.

Are there any questions?

SEWAGE PROBLEM IN LANGLEY AREA

Mr. RILEY. I have one question.

Mr. Fisher, would you not have the same problem with respect to sewage in the development of the area whether or not this building goes out there.

Mr. FISHER. We will have a similar problem on the sewage.

Mr. RILEY. Regardless of the building?

Mr. FISHER. I hope that our planning officials and our county government will be strong enough to zone the property so that the sewer problem will be within control, so that we will be able to control the present building pressure, which is great. I have no such optimism if you put this monster in terms of size and in terms of pressure in on an area which is now one of the fastest growing counties in the world.

Mr. RILEY. If you have that rapid a growth you are certainly going to have a sewage problem.

Mr. FISHER. We are. I think we will keep a lot size in this area large enough so that every lot will have a septic field which will avoid the subdivider's small treatment plant with the effluent running in the Potomac.

Mr. RILEY. That will in time contaminate the whole area, if you have enough, regardless of the size.

Mr. FISHER. The district engineer has stated in his letter of November 23, 1955, that the same assurances should be obtained from Fairfax County with regard to providing sewage for the residential development that will follow, as were obtained for the building itself. This has not been done. In his view it was necessary to be done as a pre-

requisite to action on the site. This was Col. Ray Adams, who is responsible for our drinking-water supply.

Mr. MAHON. Are there any other questions?

DESIRE TO MAINTAIN AREA AS IT NOW IS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Your fundamental desire is to preserve the character of this location as it is now?

Mr. FISHER. That is my personal desire. I believe it is also consistent with the Government's interest.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is the fundamental desire of these 700 people you speak for?

Mr. FISHER. That is right.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You feel that there are no overriding reasons for placing this building in this locality, over some other locality where it would not have the adverse effects you refer to?

Mr. FISHER. That is correct. I have spent a substantial amount of time keeping posted on this problem. I have spoken with Colonel White, and he has kindly indicated to me at length the considerations which they regard as controlling. It is my view that the best interests of the Government would be served by not locating there. This is consistent with our own interests.

If I thought this was just our community alone it would be different. If I thought that it was in the interest of the Government and the country as a whole, to put this building there, and it was just our community, I do not think I would be here today. I would say: "Somebody has to be hurt. There is no reason I should take up your time saying that 700 of us do not want to be sat upon. We will have to take that as a cost."

The fact is that the National Capital Planning Commission has studied this extensively and disapproved the site until the two people who had spent the most time on it were exchanged for other individuals representing those agencies. The fact is that both the Planning Commission and the Regional Council have insisted that if it goes out there substantial additional roads will be required now.

ACCESS ROAD FOR CONSTRUCTION

How they plan to construct this office building during the next 2 or 3 years, when served by only one 2-lane road, when the parkway itself will not be completed until the building is completed, I have no idea. That road is now about 50 percent or 100 percent overcrowded.

Mr. MAHON. That is an excellent point, and I think the CIA ought to take proper notice of it. I have been on that road many times, and I have been on it recently.

Mr. FISHER. There is a long hill coming up from Chain Bridge. Each truckload will come up in first gear. There will be an absolute bottleneck.

The Agency has suggested that they will try to schedule the trucks away from the rush hour, but you are building a building which has half of the floor space of the Pentagon using one 2-lane road.

LACK OF CONCERN IN CIA FOR PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

I do not want to attack personally any of my friends in CIA. I do believe that perhaps it is partly our own fault, that our opposition to this has made them retrench and dig in their heels. They seem to feel that the Planning Commission and the planning agencies and these committees are a series of hurdles they must overcome in order to locate where they want to go.

They did not ask, the way the Atomic Energy Commission did, for the Planning Commission's recommendations. The AEC asked for a list of sites in order of priority. The AEC chose the one on the top of the list that the Planning Commission staff had recommended.

CIA did not go to them with such a request. Although they had lots of discussions with them, the general tone I get is that they did not regard the Planning Commission as someone whose views you were to take and follow, but rather as someone whose approval you were to get so that you would not have trouble getting funds from Congress. The Commission is only advisory, of course. Both the Regional Planning Council and the Planning Commission have advisory functions.

But CIA has ignored the unanimous views of both as to how much in the way of roads is required. CIA has taken this partial approval of Langley, by split votes in each case, and says that everybody has approved. It is not the case.

(Mr. Fisher further amplified his remarks as follows:)

As we see it, CIA's strategy has always been to get congressional approval for the building at Langley first and then worry about the roads. They do not want to frighten you by telling the truth about the tremendous amount of road-building that will be necessary. Therefore they always take the position that just the one parkway and a little entrance lane will solve everything—despite the unanimous professional opinion, even by their own hired experts, that other drastic improvements are needed.

And no one should get the idea that the localities can afford these improvements. Virginia's road fund is oversubscribed for years ahead, and Fairfax County in particular is falling farther behind on road-construction needs every year. The total sum the State of Virginia has indicated it will advance in connection with any CIA project at Langley is a mere \$350,000.

As for the District, it has made clear that the Federal Government will be asked to pay for all improvements required on Chain Bridge, Canal Road, and Arizona Avenue. An editorial from the Washington Star, which I am attaching to my testimony, makes this point of Federal funds very strongly.

Colonel Thomas B. Hunter, assistant engineer, Commissioner, said in a statement as the representative of the District to the Regional Planning Council:

"The Federal Government must be prepared to supply all necessary future requirements which are not in fact supplied by the several local jurisdictions. * * * We in the District of Columbia do not feel that the setup of the District of Columbia should be required to supply these other requirements which may be later found to be necessary."

Do not be misled: They will be back year after year in this Appropriations Committee asking for Federal money to solve the road tangle.

If you appropriate funds that allow CIA to locate at Langley you will not only have junked the planned development for this area and encouraged the pollution of the upper Potomac; you will have committed Congress to the endless costs of converting a country road into a multiple-lane highway complex adequate to serve 10,000 commuters.

This appropriation will be merely the first of many. When the roads and bridges are done, this will be the most expensive building you ever built.

And why? Because Langley is the most effectant location? No, the District is concededly better. Because Langley is at a safe distance from Washington? No, Langley is within the target area. Because overwhelming planning consid-

erations dictate this site? On the contrary, it is only with the greatest of difficulty that CIA has obtained grudging approval of the site.

How many extra millions of dollars should be appropriated to carry out this Agency's whim? On March 7, 1956, the Washington Daily News quoted a CIA "spokesman" as follows:

"We'll have a beautiful spot. Our 140 acres will be surrounded by park land. We'll be able to see the river from our top story. Our building will be barely visible from public highways when leaves are off the trees in winter. In summer it will be hidden by foliage. Our workers will have parking space. They'll be able to go outside and eat their lunches under the trees."

It seems unlikely to us that Congress would even consider such a monumental plan, for a park setting with a river view, if it came from anyone else. We ask the committee simply to apply the same standards of judgment to this scheme as it would to the request of any Government agency. We are confident of the result.

I appreciate your giving me so much time.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You are not for any particular site, but you are against this one?

Mr. FISHER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. MAHON. Thank you very much.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to summarize in one word. My recommendation is that you delete so much of the funds as are to be appropriated for the parkway and include funds to acquire an alternative site, which is in the authorization.

Thank you very much.

I would like to submit for the record some editorials from the local papers, the Chicago Tribune and the New York Times, and some letters which I think might be helpful to the committee.

(The material referred to is as follows:)

[Washington Daily News, July 20, 1955]

CIA BUILDING SAGA

The Central Intelligence Agency is tired of carrying on its secret works in some not-so-secret "temporary" buildings scattered around town. It wants a building of its own, and it has told Congress it needs a big one—the second largest Government office building in the country.

Now CIA is looking for some place to put this king-sized structure. Possible sites are some Government land in Langley, Va., and the Winkler tract in Alexandria.

To get some idea of how Government officials decide these things, take a look at the qualifications of the two sites:

Langley is a rural-residential area with no public water or sewer lines. There is one school. Roads are narrow and already overcrowded. Many residents have objected violently to CIA locating here; they say it would bring on mass housing and commercial building, spoiling the area's character. To build there CIA would have to spend an extra \$8,500,000 on a road.

Alexandria's Winkler tract has water and sewer lines. A new \$2 million high school is being finished 500 yards away, and there are other schools. Apartments and houses of all sorts are available in nearby Fairfax County and Alexandria. No one has objected to CIA's locating on the site—in fact, city officials are pleading for it.

Which site does CIA Director Allen W. Dulles prefer? You guessed it—Langley.

Penetrating the mysteries of Government logic and the special mysteries of CIA as best we can, we find that the only serious reason offered for picking the clearly more expensive and less convenient Langley site is that it would be a slightly shorter auto trip for CIA employees who now live in Northwest Washington or Montgomery County.

This is bunk. By the time the CIA finishes its building 2 or 3 years from now, many of its employees will have moved near whatever site is chosen.

We hold no brief for the Winkler tract, but we can't figure out why CIA wants to go to Langley, or why Congress should permit it.

Whatever became the idea to put CIA conveniently in southwest Washington?

[Washington Post and Times Herald, November 4, 1955]

LEAVE LANGLEY ALONE

Altogether too little attention has been given to the drawbacks of the Langley, Va., site favored by consultants to the Central Intelligence Agency for the new "Junior Pentagon." If the Federal Government did not happen to own this tract along the Potomac River, no one would even suggest its use for an office center to house 10,000 or more CIA employees. Virtually every consideration is against it.

Use of the Langley site would overload Chain Bridge and Highway 123, necessitating major rehabilitation in which the District would have to share the cost. It would occasion enormous expenditures to the Federal Government and Fairfax County for other roads, water and sewage facilities. Worse, it would disrupt a lovely residential section, and inevitably it would cheapen the surrounding countryside in which homeowners have invested heavily. Fairfax zoning is notoriously pliable; and no zoning rule in the world would stand up against the residential and commercial development pressures that would follow the location there of a major Federal employment center.

If the new CIA buildings cannot become part of the Southwest Washington redevelopment program (and we still do not understand how a bomb that might hit Washington would be sure to spare Langley), then they ought to be located on the alternate tract near Alexandria. The wooded estate country upstream along the river ought to be left as it is—as one of the few remaining park-like retreats from Washington. This is as important in its way to the character of Washington as is Rock Creek Park; and the only manner in which encroachment can be prevented is by controlling population density by controlling employment centers. If, in turn, the Bureau of Public Roads tract which the CIA wants to use at Langley can't be devoted to park purposes or a Federal project that would conform to the character of the countryside, it ought to be declared surplus and sold for low-density residential development.

[Washington Post and Times Herald, November 14, 1955]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

LANGLEY AND CIA

Congratulations on your November 4 editorial opposing the plan to locate the CIA "Junior Pentagon" at Langley, Va.

From the point of view of accessibility, traffic movement, zoning, public utilities, nature conservation, and cost to the taxpayers, the Langley location is fantastically unsuitable for a vast CIA complex.

As you say, the idea could not have been dreamed up except for the fact that the Government happens to own a tract of land there. So we are to save \$100,000 or so in land purchase in order to spend millions and millions for highway and bridge enlargement. The cost of even the minimum necessary additional highway and bridge expansion to take care of CIA-Langley traffic would be appalling. Chain Bridge and Chain Bridge Road are already a nightmare at rush hours. Imagine the results if a CIA city were added to the present Langley-McLean population.

Also the Government-owned tract at Langley is a lovely unspoiled area of woodland and streams. By every adult consideration it should be turned over to the National Park Service for management as a wilderness area for posterity. Population pressure on our existing parks and wildlife refuges make it absolutely essential not to let the bulldozers gobble up such a God-given piece of unspoiled nature.

A final weird, never-never quality of the CIA-Langley idea is (as you point out) that really suitable sites are waiting with open arms in the new Southwest Washington redevelopment area and also near Alexandria—not to mention in communities 50 or more miles away—for real civil-defense dispersal.

The CIA-Langley plan can only be explained as an unrealistic whim in the higher reaches of officialdom.

NEILL PHILLIPS,
*Chairman, Conservation and Legislative Committee, Audubon
Society of D. C.*

WASHINGTON.

[Washington Post and Times Herald, November 26, 1955]

CIA AND THE LANGLEY SITE

I want to compliment the Washington Post and Times Herald on its editorials of November 4 and 22 upholding the application of planning principles for the selection of a CIA site. It was for good planning reasons that the Committee of 100 on the Federal City on October 21 adopted a resolution favoring the Shirley Highway site over the Langley site.

Since that time, and following the reports of Director Dulles and Consultant Gilmore D. Clark, before a joint meeting of the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, but before the planners have taken action, as they will at their next meeting, the CIA let it be known that the Shirley Highway site had been rejected, apparently because of the consultant's report that the land lies too low in relation to the highway and surrounding areas.

It is our information that the Shirley Highway site is hilly, some of it 250 feet above sea level and 100 feet above the highway, and that the lowland would facilitate access to the highway.

In view of the excessive cost to the Federal Government of highway, water, sewers and schools for the Langley site, as compared to the Shirley site where these utilities are immediately available without cost to the Federal Government, it would seem that these considerations should carry weight. But, even if the costs were identical, there is much to be said for preserving Langley as one of the few residential areas in the Washington metropolitan region where homes are surrounded by ample grounds.

We hope that the editorial opinion you have expressed will be applied to the final decision for the CIA site.

Maj. Gen. U. S. GRANT III,
President, American Planning and Civic Association.

WASHINGTON.

Neither the CIA officials themselves nor the planning experts they hired to support their own decision have ever shown any more than the most casual kind of attention to the problems that will be created if this agency locates at Langley. Here is just one example:

The Clarke report assumes that by the time the CIA building at Langley will be ready for occupancy various highway developments, which they admit would be necessary, will be completed. They state this despite the fact that the only commitment which has ever been secured in writing from the Virginia State highway officials is for the completion of a fraction of the total developments which will be required.

In addition, the CIA's experts did not even mention, or consider, problems that would face the area during the construction of the building.

This building will be over one-half the size of the Pentagon. It will be the second largest office building in the United States and will take 2 to 3 years to complete.

The construction of such a building will require countless carloads of building materials—lumber, cement, etc. There is no way in the world to deliver the necessary quantities of material to the Langley site under the current road conditions serving the area. There is no railroad within miles of the project. The supplies would have to be delivered by truck along the existing narrow, hilly, two-lane road, either from the District across Chain Bridge or from the Rosslyn area.

Virginia Route 123 and Chain Bridge are already inadequate to take care of the passenger traffic in the area. If Virginia residents who use Route 123 have to compete for 3 years with all the trucks which will be necessary to serve this

construction project, it will indeed be a horrible nightmare and the District of Columbia will inevitably feel its share of the traffic bottleneck. What a mess it will be!

McLEAN, VA.

SAMUEL E. NEEL.

[Washington Post and Times Herald, December 7, 1955]

ANYWHERE BUT LANGLEY

"Approval" by the National Capital Regional Planning Council of the proposed Central Intelligence Agency site at Langley, Va., is typical of the confusion bordering on farce that has surrounded CIA's efforts to bulldoze into this residential area. Because of the death of an Alexandria member whose vote against the Langley site would have reversed the position of the Council, a Falls Church alternate was enabled to cast an affirmative vote. Because of a decision attributed to the National Security Council that the CIA cannot locate its new buildings in Washington proper, the CIA is looking for a site that is neither fish nor fowl—neither dispersed nor really convenient. Because CIA officials seemingly are dead-set against use of the Winkler tract in Alexandria—among other reasons because they say the four-lane high-speed Shirley Highway is overloaded—they are doing their utmost to obtain a site bordering on a two-lane road that is far more overloaded and that would require enormous new construction.

Is it not time to end this absurd situation in which the CIA pushes around all sound planning concepts for the estate and park area upstream from Washington? If there is civil defense reason to disperse the CIA headquarters, then let it be really dispersed—to Cumberland or even to Kalamazoo, where it could be a companion piece to the lonely and very much dispersed Civil Defense Administration at Battle Creek. If access to the White House is more important than dispersal, then let the new buildings be located in Alexandria, where they would be welcome and would not violate good planning; or in Washington, which was the first choice of CIA anyhow. Incidentally, with the new Constitution Avenue bridge, a CIA headquarters near its present site in Foggy Bottom would cause less of a traffic problem than almost anywhere else. And if the name of the area bothers clear-sighted intelligence officials, no doubt it could be changed to accommodate them.

[Chicago Tribune, December 23, 1955]

BIG IF NOT GOOD

Plans of the Central Intelligence Agency to set up its headquarters in a new \$50 million building in the scenic residential area near Langley, Va., have aroused the residents of that community. They think that a Government building second only in size to the Pentagon would spoil the countryside. They foresee an influx of cloak-and-dagger boys and of merchants and people in the service trades which will quintuple the area's present population.

The National Planning Commission agrees 6 to 4, with the Langley residents. The Commission says that new highway facilities required by the agency and housing developments to accommodate its payroll and camp followers are out of all proportion to the result to be obtained.

Nevertheless, Allen W. Dulles, Director of the CIA and brother of the Secretary of State, is obdurate in insisting that the new headquarters stand on the shore of the Patomac at Langley and nowhere else. All indications are that the spy-in-chief will ignore the Planning Commission on the ground that he cannot be bound by any decision it makes.

One consideration that seems to be overlooked in this controversy is the monstrous size of the CIA operation disclosed. When one thinks of spies, he usually envisions a couple of sinister characters with hats pulled over their eyes meeting in the mouth of an alley on a foggy night. But it is apparent that Mr. Dulles' operation is more ambitious.

He seems to boss one of the largest bureaucratic empires within the Government. What work does it perform that justifies the expenditure of so huge a sum as \$50 million and requires the construction of 1 of the 2 or 3 biggest buildings in the world?

As this outfit operates under the protection of extreme secrecy, as its size and budget and expenditures are hidden in the General Government budget, and as it can always turn aside Members of Congress or other questioners with references to the national security, nobody is in a position accurately to evaluate its activities.

We do know that the Hoover Commission sharply criticized the performance of the CIA and contrasted its results unfavorably with those obtained by Soviet agents. So it can be wondered whether Allen Dulles is more interested in running a sort of country club than an intelligence operation that delivers the goods and contributes something to the security of the country.

There has been a good deal of talk about constituting a congressional watchdog committee to keep tabs on the CIA. That is better than nothing, though the committee could expect many frustrations. Meanwhile, it would be well if someone required Mr. Dulles to justify what looks like a Pharaonic ambition for monument building.

[Washington Evening Star, February 4, 1956]

PLANNING SOMERSAULT

The closely divided vote by which the National Capital Planning Commission has reversed its previous split decision against the Langley site for the Central Intelligence Agency adds confusion to a thoroughly confusing picture. Only a month ago the Commission ruled that it would be wrong to build so large a Federal office building in a residential area so poorly equipped to sustain the impact. Now the agency, in an upside-down maneuver, is on record, 7 to 5, as favoring such a location. It is all rather bewildering.

The pulling and hauling on this important matter reflect no credit on the planning principle. And the divided vote will encourage opponents of the CIA invasion of Langley to continue their fight—perhaps at the Capitol. They face an uphill battle, however, since Congress already has authorized the CIA to build there if that Agency finally decides it wants to do so. Furthermore, funds for extension of the George Washington Parkway to Langley have been approved.

Soon or late, costly improvements to Chain Bridge and the District approaches will be necessitated by the Langley project. Perhaps some of these improvements would have to be made, anyway, in years to come. But there are no definite plans and no District money available now for any such undertaking in the foreseeable future. So if it becomes necessary to rebuild or replace Chain Bridge and its approaches for the benefit of the CIA, it should be clearly understood from the very outset that the job is not a proper charge against the District. There should be no indecision and confusion about this phase of the CIA program.

[New York Times, April 13, 1956]

BULLDOZER AT WORK

Experience has shown time and time again that the bulldozer can be one of man's most destructive weapons, as well as one of his most useful tools. In the truly enormous roadbuilding program now being projected, the bulldozer can and will be both, unless some precautions are taken. Engineering alone is not the answer; yet the inclination of our society is to leave it all to the engineers without too much regard for the elements of history, of beauty, of a spiritual and community life that, being fragile in themselves, fall so easily before the onrush of the bulldozer unless they are specially protected. * * *

In Washington, D. C., one of the most powerful and autonomous of Government establishments, the Central Intelligence Agency, has been driving ahead with its plan to build a huge headquarters in a wooded tract overlooking the Potomac despite grave doubts as to the wisdom of the site by many professional planners. The area selected, already owned by the Government, might alternatively be turned into a fine park area. There are other places where the CIA could build without violating good planning principles.

The need everywhere is for long-range and balanced planning, and also for increasing attention to the intangibles that are so easily destroyed, but without which we as a nation cannot meaningfully live.

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND, SITE FOR CIA BUILDING

WITNESSES

HARRY BOSWELL, JR.
ARTHUR E. MIELKE
T. B. SYMONS

Mr. SYMONS. Mr. Chairman, for the record let me say that Mr. Harry Boswell, Jr., a member of our committee, has come in since the first record was made.

I want to make a very brief statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAHON. The fact is that we can be in session here only a few more minutes.

Mr. SYMONS. Would you rather have us come back at another time?

Mr. MAHON. No. Since your statement is brief, we would be pleased to hear you now. What is the idea you wish to express?

Mr. SYMONS. Our idea was that in the interest of economy and in the interest of efficiency and in the interest of the broad principles of developing our suburban area and the city of Washington that the committee and the Agency should give consideration to a site in Prince Georges County which will be much more economical, and we think more convenient and efficient, for the location of this magnificent Agency.

Let me say in advance that none of us have any personal interest in this matter, save the general interest as represented by Mr. Fisher.

Just to give you a general view of the situation, we have a map here [indicating].

Mr. MAHON. Where do you propose a location?

Mr. SYMONS. We propose a location at Good Luck Road, which is just south of Greenbelt, Md. Langley is over here [indicating].

Mr. MAHON. You propose a site considerably east of the Langley site, which is in the Greenbelt area?

Mr. SYMONS. Which is south of the Greenbelt area.

DISTANCE FROM ZERO MILESTONE

Mr. MAHON. How far is it from zero milestone?

Mr. SYMONS. About 8.5 miles. You can make it in a 20-minute drive.

Mr. MAHON. 8.5 miles?

Mr. SYMONS. Yes, sir. With the completion of the new bridge, Anacostia Bridge, and with the parkway to Baltimore and with the roads that are presently built it can be done.

CONSIDERATION OF SITE BY CIA

Mr. MAHON. Colonel White, has this site been considered?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir; this site was very carefully considered.

Mr. MAHON. Why was it vetoed?

Mr. WHITE. Because of the time and distance factors and the accessibility to employees.

For example, from the Glendale Road to the zero milestone is 13.5 miles, and on the 28th of May at 8:15 in the morning from a starting time it took 34 minutes to get in.

On the 25th of May, during the rush hour afternoon traffic, starting at 5:15 p. m. from the zero milestone, it is a distance of 13.8 miles and it took 52 minutes to get there. It takes too long for key officials to get to the White House, State Department, and other places to which they must travel.

Furthermore, if you look at the map and remember where our employees live, there is no way to get them to this site except to drag them through the streets of Washington, which already is congested, so this site from a time and distance factor, both from the standpoint of being able to get to the key people with whom we work and being able to get our employees to and from the site, was ruled out.

Mr. MAHON. Many would move to that general area, of course.

Mr. WHITE. They would have to. That is one of the things which we do not feel will happen at the Langley site, because they are more convenient, if anything, to the Langley site than to our present headquarters.

NEW ACCESS ROADS

Mr. BOSWELL. These figures were based on roads in existence at that time and did not consider roads under construction. As Mr. Symons pointed out, with the addition of the Anacostia River Bridge, which is about completed now, and the East Capitol Street Bridge, these connections now presently under construction, both time and distance figures used by Colonel White are significantly altered.

In other words, the criteria used with reference to Langley were based on roads which were not even projected.

With regard to this site, the CIA refused to use a consideration of roads then under construction, and used roads only then in existence.

Is that correct, Colonel White?

Mr. WHITE. We obviously had to use the roads in existence.

Mr. MAHON. You are not using roads in existence on the Langley site; are you?

Mr. WHITE. No, sir. The George Washington Memorial Parkway already has been authorized.

Mr. MAHON. These other things are, too.

Mr. WHITE. These other things would not alter the time situation, sir.

I have run this as many as 15 or 20 times. The very best time that we have ever been able to make during, say, 1 o'clock in the afternoon, when nobody is going to and from out there, is about 24 minutes.

When you get into the rush-hour traffic, the East Capitol Street Bridge and the South Capitol Street Bridge are already congested. You cannot throw this in there.

Mr. SYMONS. Did you try the Baltimore and Washington Parkway?

Mr. WHITE. It is terribly full.

Mr. SYMONS. The Baltimore-Washington Parkway goes through this property.

Mr. MAHON. This is the general idea you want to present?

NEED FOR BALANCED DEVELOPMENT OF WASHINGTON AREA

Mr. BOSWELL. We have another principle we want to present. Part of the criteria being used by the CIA and other agencies today with regard to the location of their present employees we think is extremely

unfortunate from the consideration of the ultimate development of this city of Washington, because the greatest balance with regard to population, both by age, wealth, and different categories of employment, can be achieved, greatest stability for the National Capital can be achieved by a wide pattern of dispersal around the city.

Mr. MAHON. In other words, if you locate all of your more important agencies in one area you tend to put other areas of the metropolitan area in a worsened position?

Mr. BOSWELL. That is right. This flies in the face of reason when we recognize the fluidity of employment in the District of Washington and a study of change made in change of residents when the Bethesda Institute of Health and other places were established. People do move to come to their places of employment.

If agencies are located because the top people in certain top agencies live in the vicinity of certain of these agencies, where they are talking about locating them now, because many of the people presently live there, if we continue this pattern we will warp the future of our National Capital.

Mr. MAHON. In other words, you do not want a Spring Valley complex?

Mr. BOSWELL. That is right. We are developing that not with regard to the CIA only but with regard to many of the other agencies and their locations. We have the opportunity for a wide pattern of dispersal of the governmental office buildings, and we must recognize there is a wide divergence between the levels of employment. For example, the Census Bureau has a lot of file clerks on a lower wage level and the CIA has an extremely high wage level.

If we are going to put all of the lower level agencies in the areas where the lower level people are presently located, and the higher level agencies in the area where the higher level people presently are located, we will keep warping the city in proportion completely in variance with what we are able to do with our high-speed highways today.

Mr. MAHON. Speaking of high-level people, we do not have high-level people and low-level people. You mean from an income level?

Mr. BOSWELL. That is so, from an income basis. We think it is wise and we think most planners would agree to that.

At one time city growth was controlled by a system so that good-income people went beyond areas where good-income people presently were located, so our city pattern is somewhat warped, having a right and wrong side of the tracks. With high-speed highways and opportunity to relocate employment, particularly in this National Capital area, we have a chance to have this dispersal not just on employment but also to avoid the homogeneous nature which was part of our past. If we have a possibility of establishing a heterogeneous population around the city, we no longer have a right and wrong side of the track.

The principal arguments being advanced too frequently by Government agencies today is that here there is a right and wrong side of the track, we want to be on the right side, and they are warping the growth of the National Capital in a way we hope will not be accomplished.

ACCESS ROADS

Mr. SYMONS. Here are 1,000 acres. The CIA can make it as lovely a spot as they wish. It is less than a mile from the University of Maryland across there.

I disagree with our friend Colonel White because our records show you can reach this point in 20 minutes. We have tried it 2 or 3 times over new roads.

The difference was 20 minutes to zero in Washington.

Mr. WHITE. This discussion between us has been going on for about a year now. The best test that I know of who is right on this, in discussing this with Mr. Gingry and Mr. Wells, your Maryland planners, we agreed to drive out there together. It took us 31 minutes to go out and 43 minutes to come back.

Mr. SYMONS. When the roads were bad.

Mr. WHITE. We went out over the Washington-Baltimore Parkway. This was at noontime when there was no traffic on the road.

Mr. BOSWELL. The Washington-Baltimore Parkway is connected from here to New York Avenue. This is not the best route into town. The plans are now under way for a completion down through this point and into East Capitol Street. These roads are not available even though they are presently under construction.

ATTITUDE OF AREA RESIDENTS

Mr. MALLON. How many people would probably sign a petition asking you not to locate the CIA there?

Mr. BOSWELL. The town officers and the local people are in complete agreement and have expressed their desire, as Colonel White knows.

Mr. SYMONS. Including the vote by the county commission.

Mr. MALLON. The local authorities were in the Glendale area?

Mr. BOSWELL. Including the local people. All the local people in local meetings have said "Yes, we want the CIA here." Colonel White is acquainted with that.

LAND AVAILABLE

Mr. SYMONS. This is an aerial photo of the site. There are no homes in this 1,100-acre tract. It is very sparsely populated in the area.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Who owns that land?

Mr. BOSWELL. This is not just the Washington-Baltimore Parkway and Edmonston Road, but also the circumferential highway around the district which is adjacent to the site. You have not only the matter of being able to locate directly into town but also from the standpoint of employees all the way around the city, being able to come in when the parkway is completed.

I think anyone would recognize this is advanced in advance of the roads that are being talked of with regard to the Langley site.

In other words, while neither one is there, this is ahead of the other. These are direct roads into town with dual highways connecting in and also a circumferential road into town.

FACILITIES AVAILABLE

Mr. SYMONS. Sewer, water, and power already is there, at no expense whatever. And to think we would spend \$10 million to provide those accommodations at Langley. It is preposterous to us.

I think this is something your committee wants to hear. We are not very far from Friendship Airport. That is an asset for the Agency. You are within a 30-minute drive and less than that to the Friendship Airport. We consider that as an asset rather than an objection.

We appreciate the time.

Mr. MAHON. It is stimulating to have you here.

Mr. SYMONS. I want you to think that we are interested only in the economy, efficiency, and welfare of the Agency, as well as the county and the District as a whole. We have nothing whatever to submit except earnest consideration of arguments that are apparent which Mr. Fisher presented.

Mr. BOSWELL. We feel, not only with regard to CIA but dispersion of all Government agencies, this matter of balance in the city is one which must receive urgent consideration.

Mr. MAHON. I have observed that you undoubtedly feel that so many of our high-income people live in the Northwest, and they do not want to place important installations in the Washington area in a section which would make it more difficult for them.

Mr. SYMONS. I can appreciate that.

Mr. BOSWELL. We have not minded being considered poor cousins. With the great steps we have taken in providing the finest sort of educational facilities and roads we are doing today, we think it is a shame that the Federal Government would compound this feeling that we will have to continue as poor customers because top people don't want to live in our area.

Mr. MAHON. Thank you very much.

Mr. SYMONS. The university is a half mile from here. I think this installation is comparable to anything around the District. It is not an area which would degrade the CIA or offer them any inconvenience. They have clean acreage; no buildings around here. They could make a lovely a spot there with those 1,100 acres, with transportation on both sides; water, sewer, and everything.

Thank you very much.

CIA SITE CRITERIA

Mr. MIELKE. This is a set of criteria sent out by CIA for sites. One is for suburban and one for cities.

Mr. MAHON. Insert it in the record at this point.

(The information referred to is as follows:)

Criteria for location of C. I. A. site—Suburban

Factors	Mandatory	Desirable
1. Time and distance to key points (official).....	10 miles and 20 minutes to zero mile-stone.	7 miles. 15 minutes.
2. Area (suitable topography).....	50 acres with 100 percent usability	70 to 100 acres.
3. Accessibility:		
(a) Access roads and highways.....	To handle 3,000 passenger cars per hour.	5,000 per hour and/or 2 highways.
(b) Public transportation.....	A available potential.	
4. Utilities: Sewer, water, power.....	A available to site boundary.....	Existing in sufficient size.
5. Availability of site.....	2 years.....	Immediately.
6. Compatibility with existing and proposed land use and comprehensive plan.....	Recommendations of subcommittee of NCPD and planning boards.	

Mr. MIELKE. I would like to point out that in considering all sites other than the Langley site, all of these criteria were examined and applied to the exact degree, whereas as a matter of fact if you want to travel from the Langley site to the White House, zero mile zone, you would have to use a helicopter to get there in the time limit that they point out.

There are other considerations. They say utilities, sewer, water power, availability of site, compatability with existing and proposed land use, and comprehensive plans, all of these were applied to the minutest details to other sites which were advanced, whereas they were not applied in general to the Langley site.

Mr. MAHON. Thank you very much.

(The following excerpt from a pamphlet of the Prince Georges Chamber of Commerce was submitted for the record:)

The Central Intelligence Agency has listed six factors with "mandatory" and "desirable" criteria applicable to each in connection with a site for a headquarters' installation.

The criteria and how they apply to the proposed Prince Georges County site are:

1. Time and distance to key points: Mandatory, 10 miles and 20 minutes to Zero Milestone (the White House); or, desirable, 7 miles and 15 minutes.

The distance to Zero Milestone is 8.5 miles. When the express approaches to the East Capitol Street Bridge are completed, the driving time will be between 18 and 20 minutes. The bridge will be opened to traffic in November 1955.

2. Area (suitable topography): Mandatory, 50 acres with 100 percent usability; or, desirable, 70 to 100 acres.

The Federal Government (Interior Department) owns 1,100 acres at the proposed site. Except for streams, the entire tract has 100 percent usability.

3. Accessibility:

(a) Access roads and highways: Mandatory, to handle 3,000 passenger cars per hour; or, desirable, 5,000 cars per hour.

(b) Public transportation: Mandatory (only), available potential.

Five major traffic arteries (Baltimore-Washington Parkway, U. S. Route No. 1, Queens Chapel Road-Michigan Avenue, Edmonston Road, and New Hampshire Avenue) could accommodate many more than the "desirable" 5,000 cars per hour. In addition, cross-county roads—supplying excellent "around Washington" routes—are either being built or improved at the present time.

Nearby Greenbelt has bus facilities and the Capital Transit Company operates a line to within a short distance of the site.

4. Utilities—sewer, water, power: Mandatory, available to site boundary; or, desirable, existing in sufficient size.

Water and sewer lines run directly past the site. City power is available.

5. Availability of site: Mandatory, 2 years; or, immediately.

Since the Government owns this site it is, of course, immediately available.

6. Compatibility with existing and proposed land use and comprehensive plan: Mandatory (only), recommendations of subcommittee of the National Capital Planning Commission and Planning Boards.

Since there is no construction in the immediate area of the site, the proposed CIA headquarters would set the land use pattern. The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the county governmental body (Board of County Commissioners) and the residents of nearby communities (Greenbelt, College Park) have expressed eagerness for such an installation at the proposed site.

(The following information was submitted for the record:)

The December issue of Planning and Civic Comment, the official publication of the American Planning and Civic Association and the National Conference on

State Parks, with headquarters in Washington's Union Trust Building, has this to say of the choice of Langley, Va., for the CIA headquarters:

"However, in the city of Washington the location of new Federal buildings involves a process of conforming to the comprehensive plan and coordinating with citywide utilities. Under the dispersal plan adopted for defense purposes, and in the location of Federal buildings in the metropolitan area around Washington, there are in the existing communities many planning decisions to be reached. It is not simply a matter of the Federal agency deciding where it would like to be located regardless of the impact on the community. And when the agency is a large one which may employ some 10,000 persons, there should be taken into consideration the existing and potential access roads and bridges, the availability of water, sewers, schools and shopping conveniences. States and counties are frequently in no financial position to provide these promptly, but, if a site can be found which does offer these facilities, there is no reason for the Federal Government to undertake a large capital investment for a site not so served.

"It is upon these principles that the Committee of 100 on the Federal City of the American Planning and Civic Association has opposed the location of the Central Intelligence Agency at Langley, Va., where a community pattern for gracious living has been developed over a long period of years, where there are at present no adequate access roads and bridges, where, apparently, the proponents of the site are depending unduly on the building in the near future of the George Washington Memorial Parkway for a use to which it should never be subjected. A parkway in hilly country is not designed for maximum traffic and is limited to passenger cars. In any case, the parkway is authorized and will be built when Congress appropriates the money, but it will not provide the business access highway which the CIA evidently expects it to be.

"If the CIA headquarters were to be located where the dispersal act would indicate, the site would be further from Washington than any of those considered. But as a special dispensation Congress has authorized the CIA to choose a site nearer the White House. Since there are other sites which meet all the criteria set up, there is no excuse for disrupting the Langley neighborhood, for taking over Federally-owned land that should be preserved as open space and watershed cover, for jeopardizing the Memorial Parkway by subjecting it to punishing uses, and by forcing the Federal Government to assume costs of utilities which there is little prospect that the State of Virginia or the county of Fairfax will provide promptly."

(The following letter was received for inclusion in the record from the Wilderness Society:)

JUNE 5, 1956.

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON,
*Chairman, Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction,
House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MAHON: I understand that your subcommittee has been considering appropriations for a new CIA central headquarters agency. There has been discussion about locating these quarters on part of the Bureau of Public Roads property near Langley, Va.

The proposed site near Langley is ideally suited to use as a public park. Its rolling meadows, stands of wildflowers, and hardwood forests, together with a mile and a half of shore line along the Potomac, and the presence of wildlife such as opossum and deer, and varieties of birds, add to the public interest in the prospective park values of the area from Chain Bridge to and including Great Falls.

It would not be in the interest of sound planning to disregard and lose these public park values. It would be advisable to locate the proposed CIA central headquarters agency on some other site where such values could not be impaired.

I should very much appreciate your consideration of these views and would like to have this statement of them included in the record.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD ZAHNISER.